DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 894

UD 004 088

SOCIAL MALADJUSTMENT: BEHAVIOR CHANGE AND EDUCATION. PROCEEDINGS OF THE ANNUAL INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE ON URBAN EDUCATION (5TH, MAY 3, 1966).

Yeshiva Univ., New York, N.Y. Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Spons Agency-New York State Dept. of Mental Hygiene, Albany.

Pub Date 3 May 66

Note-109p.

Available from-Yeshiva University, Ferkauf Graduate School, 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003 ($2.50)

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES, *BEHAVIOR CHANGE, *BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS, BIBLIOGRAPHIES, COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT, CONFERENCE REPORTS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, ECONOMIC DISADVANTAGEMENT, EDUCATIONAL EXPERIMENTS, SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT, *URBAN EDUCATION, URBAN ENVIRONMENT

These proceedings contain four papers and commentaries by scholars on the problems of the socially disadvantaged child in the urban school. The papers discuss (1) cognitive development and psychopathology in the urban environment, (2) an experimental approach to the remediation of the conduct disorders of children, (3) juvenile delinquency in the urban schools, and (4) the effect of poverty on the education of the urban child. The proceedings also contain lists of proceedings of conferences on urban education held at Yeshiva University and reports published by the Ferkauf Graduate School of the University. (LB)

04088

FERKAUF GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES · YESHIVA UNIVERSITY
55 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, N. Y. 10003

THEME:

SOCIAL MALADJUSTMENT:
BEHAVIOR CHANGE AND EDUCATION

UD 004 088
ED021894

Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Invitational
Conference on Urban Education · May 3, 1966

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FERKAUF GRADUATE SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

YESHIVA UNIVERSITY

55 Fifth Avenue ....New York, N.Y. 10003

THEME:

SOCIAL MALADJUSTMENT: BEHAVIOR CHANGE AND EDUCATION

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIFTH ANNUAL INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE ON URBAN EDUCATION - MAY 3, 1966

UD 004 088

These proceedings are published
through the cooperation of the
New York State Department of
Mental Hygiene, which helped
support the conference.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 3

Cognitive Development and Psychopathology in the Urban Environment

E 04089 DR. EDGAR AUERSWALD 7

DISCUSSANT: DR. VERA JOHN 32

An Empirical Experimental Approach To The Nature and Remediation of Conduct Disorders of Children

E DR. HERBERT QUAY 36

04090 DISCUSSANT: DR. BLUMA WEINER 50

The Urban Schools and Juvenile Delinquency

04091 DR. WILLIAM KVARACEUS 54

E DISCUSSANT: MR. RHODY McCOY 68

Education and Problems of Poverty

04092 DR. RICHARD CLOWARD 71

E DISCUSSANT: DR. DOXEY WILKERSON 94

DISCUSSANT OF CONFERENCE THEME

DR. SOL GORDON 100

APPENDIX

PROCEEDINGS OF INVITATIONAL CONFERENCES ON URBAN EDUCATION 107

LIST OF EDUCATION REPORTS 108

Social Maladjustment: Behavior Change and Education

The decline of the big city and the advent of the civil rights movement are considered to be among the two most significant domestic events of the decade. These events have been marked by turmoil and uncertainty.

Inextricably bound up in the struggles marking these events has been the problem of the role of the schools. Never before has so much attention been paid to the successes and failures of the big city schools. Never before has so much money and thought gone into the schools, and never before have the school's failings been so candidly discussed. Coupled with this focus on the schools has been a concern with the anomie, depersonalization, delinquency, and psychopathology which are byproducts of the decay of the big city.

In many ways the schools mirror the pathology of the inner cities: the schools have been overcrowded, understaffed, underfinanced and as a consequence have often responded with a rigid posture. In some ways the big city schools have been inadequate to the tasks for which they have been charged. At this time, the schools are charged with ever increasing burdens, and now the schools mirror the hopes and concerns of the nation in its quest for The Great Society.

This conference includes scholars concerned with the urban environment and the urban schools. Of great significance to this conference sponsored by a School of Education is the interdisciplinary and holistic frame of reference which has been engendered by the topic. The disciplines of medicine, social work, education and psychology are represented and subtantive questions are being examined by scholars functioning within the coordinating framework of behavioral science.

For this 5th Annual Conference on Urban Education it is significant that a Department of Special Education was asked to set the theme. This meeting will concern itself with the fact that in certain urban school districts a dropout rate which exceeds 50% is not uncommon in classrooms for children that are not considered exceptional in the usual meaning of that term. Surely, special education is called for in these cases if the schools are to achieve their goals. A melding of the behavioral sciences and education is called for if we are to reverse the failings of the past. New questions must be raised and new techniques tried if we are to succeed now where previously we failed.

To that end the following behavioral scientists will address themselves to the topic of Social Maladjustment; Behavior Change and Education.

Dr. Edgar Auerswald
Chief of Psychiatric Services
Beth Israel Medical Center
New York, New York

Dr. Richard Cloward
Professor of Social Work
Columbia University
New York, New York

Dr. Sol Gordon
Department of Educational Psychology and Guidance
Ferkauf Graduate School, Yeshiva University

Dr. Vera John
Department of Educational Psychology and Guidance
Ferkauf Graduate School, Yeshiva University

Dr. William Kvaraceus
Director of Youth Studies and
Professor of Education
Lincoln Filene Youth Center
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts

Mr. Rhody McCoy
Principal, P.S.148M
New York City Board of Education

Dr. Herbert Quay
Children's Research Center
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Dr. Bluma Weiner
Department of Special Education
Ferkauf Graduate School, Yeshiva University

Dr. Doxey Wilkerson
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Ferkauf Graduate School, Yeshiva University

We hope their remarks will encourage new programs and further research on the part of all the helping professions.

Paul S. Graubard
Morton Bortner

Department of Special Education
5th Annual Invitational Conference

4089

Cognitive Development and Psychopathology in the Urban Environment

EDGAR H. AUERSWALD, M.D.
Beth Israel Medical Center, New York, N.Y.

Most scientists, at this point in time, agree that man as a species owes his dominance among living organisms and his survival to the evolutionary acquisition of a unique central nervous system. In particular, his resultant capacity for the development and use of symbols allows for the creative acquisition, accumulation, synthesis, communication and storage of knowledge.

In the world of today, with its tendencies toward dehumanization of the individual, the struggle of each man to define his own identity during his trip from the womb to the grave has come more and more under scrutiny. It has become clear that certain kinds of knowledge must be assimilated by each individual if he is to win that struggle.

Werner, Piaget, Inhelder, Bruner, Witkin, and recently many others, each from their own vantage point, have pointed out that in the course of growth and maturation, clear and well-differentiated concepts of space and of relationships between objects must develop if the internal operations of the growing child are to remain rooted in external reality.

Concepts of size, shape, weight, and the color of objects, the concept of motility, and concepts of distance and direction must develop. Language symbols to label and differentiate objects, to describe and think about them and to discern and describe their relationships must be learned. All of these concepts are necessary if the growing individual is to develop a sense of stable spatial orientation, a sense of his own position as a separate object in space, and a clear concept of his own body image.

Likewise, the sense of time passage and the capacity to organize the sequential order of events in time, again accompanied by appropriate language symbols to describe and think about these relationships, must develop.

Most intricate of all is the process in the growing child of differentiating, labelling, and identifying the many diverse ingredients of human interaction necessary if he is to function efficiently in a large variety of roles demanded by different life situations. As he develops, the infant-child-adolescent-adult must gain sufficient clarity in his internal representation of these ingredients of external reality to allow him to understand and differentiate the reality context of the life transactions in which he is involved at any one point in time. He must know the language of those transactions and his role within them. Only then will he be able to define his own identity boundaries in that situation and tie his own internal feelings to the external or internalized referents that will allow him to identify them.

This process of identity definition is not just a matter of getting oriented to life. As Erikson, Wynne and others have pointed out, it is a fundamental necessity for survival.

Like all higher animals, man is not a totally independent creature. He is a "member of groups", beginning with his biological origins of birth into a "family" of some configuration or other depending on the culture into which he is born, on his family's sub-cultural affiliations, his culture itself, and finally the groups he is drawn to affiliate with. Indeed, his own sense of identity is largely dependent on his past and present group memberships.

And his inherent need for closeness and attachment with other human beings is, according to the degree of intimacy he is able to establish, dependent on the feeling of being an integral part of his various groups. He gets his sense of belonging through this process of affiliation. There is abundant evidence that individual man cannot thrive, and indeed, may not be able to survive, without at least one such affiliation of a sufficient degree of intimacy.

The most important atmospheric ingredient necessary to develop in each growing child and to maintain in each adult that sense of belonging to the group he so desperately needs, is an atmosphere of acceptance. This means that messages conveyed by the actions and words of those around him must be first, "We want you with us", or at least, "We do not want to get rid of you," and second, "We will respond to you when you send us a message.

For an infant, perhaps, the sense of belonging is enough, but as a child grows into adulthood, because of the growing complexity of the society man's accumulated knowledge has led him to construct, more is needed. In order to maintain his image of self-worth and to give meaning to his life, he needs a sense of participation. Belonging to a group is not enough; he must have a clear picture of the structure and operations of the group to which he belongs, and within the context of this knowledge he must see quite clearly and in detail the nature of his usefulness, his functions, and his tasks within the group. He must, in other words, possess practical knowledge which gives him the capacity to participate.

The need for these ingredients is present in varying intensity and configuration in any situation in which two or more people are participating in some kind of operational transaction. This is true of any life arena, whether the relatively permanent group arena of marriage and the family, or the temporary but fairly prolonged group of the classroom, or the temporary transaction between the drugstore clerk and the customer who buys a bar of candy. Many examples of kinds of situations which prevent an individual from defining his identity as a social being, a part of a community, can be cited.

In the latter instance of the transaction between drugstore clerk and customer, the Puerto Rican who has moved into a neighborhood where no clerk speaks Spanish or where prejudicial attitudes toward Spanish-speaking people pervade the atmosphere, is hardly likely to find in the buying transaction with a hostile or indifferent clerk, evidence that he is part of the community. On the contrary, he is likely to feel excluded. He will get a sense of participation from the transaction since, because it is simple and short-lived and he knows how to carry it out, it has been concluded, but it will be empty and of little value to his self-esteem since it took place in an arena where he could not get a sense of belonging. He is then likely to seek out a store run by a Spanish-American compatriot, if one exists, and he will view that store as a haven in an essentially hostile community. He will thus abet his own isolation from the community-at-large. If he has no other arena to turn to, or if he knows too little about his own cultural heritage to have pride in it, the drugstore experience can be shattering. And unless he is an unusual person, he is not very likely to take the only alternative open to him of learning the new language and setting out to organize a campaign to eradicate the prejudice of the community.

In like manner, the "disadvantaged" child who, as a result of a lack of organized learning experiences at home, is unable to conceptualize the nature and purpose of his first grade class group, its usefulness to him, and the teacher's tasks and his own tasks there, must rely entirely on his sense of belonging. That sense of belonging depends largely on the responsiveness of his teacher or, to a lesser extent, his classmates. Only if he gets responses that give him this sense will he get meaning from the experience. He is not prepared to develop a sense of participation, since the building blocks of sequential learning, which would allow him to construct the abstract concepts necessary to his understanding of the purpose, operations, and tasks of the classroom, either have not been available to him, or have been presented to him in such a disorganized manner that he could not integrate them. Therefore, if his teacher, busy in a class of 30, cannot respond directly to him with sufficient intensity and frequency to maintain at least his sense of belonging, or, if the child comes from a minority group toward whom the teacher responds with even the most subtle of prejudice, he will have neither a sense of participation or belonging. He will, as a result, have no motivation to remain. He already has little motivation to learn, not only because he is unprepared to learn in the manner and at the level the school requires, but also because he is preoccupied with maintaining his sense of belonging by evoking _a_ response. The content for learning of the response is irrelevant to him under these circumstances. Thus he may simply leave the classroom. He may hang around for a few days, weeks, or months, if sufficient sense of belonging _is_ provided for him by his teacher or, sometimes, his peers. He may also remain if he is in danger of losing his sense of belonging at home by disobeying his parents who want him to be in school. But he will learn very little. And the forces which tend to eject him from the school arena will accumulate, since he is labelled a non-learner or a slow learner, and he poses a problem for the school staff. On the way out he may acquire other labels by being assigned to a special class of some sort, or, perhaps, a psychological or psychiatric diagnosis. Sooner or later the vectors that keep him there will succumb to the vectors that exclude him, and he will leave under the label of "drop-out."

The middle or upper class infant-child-adolescent who for whatever the reasons, has lived for most of his developing years in a communications vacuum in his own family, may wind up in a similar position. He is more likely than the disadvantaged child to have learned some of the tools of operational participation in some life arenas, but he is often deficient in techniques of establishing intimacy with others or of participation in highly competitive arenas. Thus, although his sense of belonging in his own family may be tenuous, it is better than any which he can establish anywhere else. His efforts to function away from his family in college or in a competitive job when he reaches late adolescence are short-lived, and he scurries back to a home he hates, or, perhaps, to some psychiatrists office.

These examples are cited to illustrate the type of phenomena that isolate people from the community in which they live. They are phenomena that fragment a community rather than integrate it and are unhealthy in their outcome. They produce states of psychological and/or social pathology in the people who are caught in them. They cut across the boundaries of ethnic group, socio-economic class, sub culture, culture and society, national origin, educational background of parents, and geographical area. They have common roots in the fact that the tools of participation in the individual have not been developed to a level of complexity necessary to adapt to a given environmental field. The balance between the complexity of the environmental field and the level of cognitive development in the individual turns out to be the key. It is this interface, therefore, that must be studied and understood.

In today's urban world this interface is becoming increasingly complex. What is needed is a fairly detailed map of the various arenas in which the urban dweller must be able to function efficiently if he is to become and remain a participant in the life of his community, and a clear model of the sequential process of cognitive development through which he must go if he is to internalize a well differentiated view of those arenas and develop the tools he needs for participating in them.

Much work has been done on the former of these two tasks, work complicated by the fact that no two urban communities are precisely the same. But, in my opinion, far too little is being done to handle the latter need, largely, I believe, because popular learning theory does not lend itself easily to the task. A more holistic theory of cognitive development is needed. Let me make a stab at such a theory.

Piaget, especially, has emphasized that cognitive capacities develop through a sequential process. The theory implicit in his way of describing this sequence might be called the "building block theory of conceptual development." He pointed out how assimilated percepts, beginning with the most simple and concrete, form the "building blocks" out of which larger and more abstract concepts are formed and integrated in the child. Some of these abstract concepts or schema allow for the growing child's entry into the world of ideas in symbolic terms. Others allow him to internally reconstruct the shape of external reality. In the latter process, when a given concept reaches a point of relative congruence with its corresponding unit of external reality, it becomes the context within which new concepts are built and tested, or, in turn, a larger "building block" for more complex concepts which become larger contexts, etc., etc.

In the developing infant-child-adolescent-adult, the degree of and areas of differentiated internalized reality will depend on the quantity and quality of his experience in terms of the availability in appropriate sequences of messages from his surroundings that provide the appropriate "building blocks" at the point in time when he is ready to use them. This differentiation will also depend on the way in which those "building blocks" are subsequently integrated, as well as on the integrity of his anatomical, physiological, and biochemical apparatus.

The messages received by the developing child, in addition to the role emphasized above, play another important role, that of determining and maintaining the stability of personality integration.

The recent work on the effects of sensory deprivation shows that the global diminution of incoming perceptual messages results in various degrees of personality disorganization in the individual thus deprived of stimuli. Thus, communications themselves, regardless of content, are important in the maintenance of stable integration.

Furthermore, the integrity, the organization, and the sequential order of communications taking place in any system are further determinants of the stability of that system.

For example, the recent exciting work on the role of DNA and RNA in the activation of organized biochemical systems which determine species specific and familial genetic traits points out the role of RNA as a molecular carrier of messages. The implication of this work is that any interruption or shift in sequence of transmission of these messages will disrupt the integration of complicated biochemical operations in a manner which could have a profound effect on the total organism.

Likewise, the hormones of the endocrine system share with autonomic nerve impulses the role of maintaining organization and integration of vegetative functions in animals and man. They are the purveyors of messages which integrate these complicated functions. When for any reason they do not deliver their messages, or do so in improper sequence, profound functional disorganization can take place.

Loss of a sensory system, as in blindness or deafness, with resultant loss of incoming perceptions, has been shown to seriously impede the capacity of the individual to develop and maintain adaptive behavior of certain kinds which is sufficiently well-integrated with environmental reality so as to be effective.

In all of these examples, the role of messages, whether molecularly or biochemically carried, in the form of nerve impulses within the organism or sensory perceptual stimuli from without, is the maintenance of systemic integration and of the integration of one system with others. In other words, that which is communicated forms part of the "glue" of integration, and is in itself an "integrating factor."

Having emphasized the structure, organization, and general content of assimilated experience in the growing individual, let us now turn to a discussion of more specific content of internalized concepts.

As a child grows through time and in populated space, he receives from his surroundings repetitive incoming perceptual messages containing specific content, at first largely from his family. Some of these repetitive themes come from the ideosyncratic organization, history, and operations of the family. Others, transmitted through his family, come from its subcultural affiliations, and later, as the child moves ever farther out from the womb, from his surrounding society. These communications are made up of a large variety of messages, verbal and non-verbal, explicit and implicit, and contain certain themes.

Until his school years, most of these messages will come to the child from members of his family and from the operations of his family as a system. Thus, he will first integrate the themes prevalent in his familial surroundings. By the time the child enters school, therefore, he will have assimilated the basic thematic content that will determine the "style" of his personality development. And, of course, once the child enters school, he will receive many more messages reflecting the ingredients of the larger society in which he lives which, building upon that "style", will provide him with a large variety of additional information and life roles.

Since messages themselves serve as the "glue" which maintains integrated functional operation, every child will receive then, first from his familial and later from his societal surroundings, a number of repetitive thematic messages which will form the framework around which he will wrap his evolving personality integration. These thematic messages might be labelled "integrating themes."

The degree to which a child will develop a sufficiently differentiated view of reality to assure his effective adaptation to the large variety of differing life situations with which he will be presented in our complex and changing society will depend on the quantity, quality, clarity, and differentiation according to life operations of the "integrating themes" around which he organizes himself.

The role of language in all of the above processes cannot be overemphasized. Especially important, as Bernstein, John, and others have pointed out, is the necessity for the child not only to assimilate language symbols sufficient to denote the details of inner and outer realities but also to learn the many connotative nuances dictated by language structure and usage in the culture and subcultures in which he functions and in the various transactional arenas within that culture. Furthermore, he not only needs symbols with which to label objects and abstract concepts, but he needs a wide range of symbols he can use to label his subjective feelings which will again be sufficient to insure a range which will allow him to identify a wide differential of possible emotional responses to a wide range of stimulus situations.

Certain concepts or groups of related concepts play especially important in this process. Let us explore one example. One such concept is the concept of similarity, the least abstract of a grouping of concepts which includes the concepts of analogy and of metaphor.

The process of categorization of experience serves several very important functions. First of all, it allows for the generalized use of similar adaptive behavior patterns with, perhaps, only minor accomodations in situations that fit into a particular category. Secondly, it insures a greater sense of mastery and lessens the sense of anticipatory anxiety that occurs in all people faced with an entirely new situation, since the growing child learns as he develops that more and more life situations tend to fall into categories for which he has effective adaptive responses. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, this process of categorization tends to fix the sense of time passage in the individual. Experiences take place one at a time, but when a category of experience forms, experiences taking place over a time span are tied together by their similarities, concrete or analogous. The threads connecting these similarities allow the child to see his past with a sense of order. Furthermore, they give the past meaning in the present, since some of these threads of similarity will always connect with the current situation. In this way, he can also develop the concept that the present has relevance to the future.

In the studies of children done by Inhelder et.al., using the Piagetian concept of operativity, it was found that the child attained operativity by the fourteenth year. It is reasonable to infer, therefore, that if all has gone well, the adolescent will, at this point, have developed a view of reality sufficient in quantity, quality, clarity, and differentiation of "integrating themes" to insure his possession of adaptive behavior patterns which can deal appropriately with most of the life situations in which he is likely to find himself. From this point on he needs only to fill in his knowledge with detail and develop his skills with practice. Furthermore, as a result of having successfully traversed this developmental road, he will have developed a sufficient sense of mastery and a capacity for abstract thinking which will allow him to accomodate and anticipate change. In cognitive terms, he is ready to move out into the world.

Now let us hypothesize what might interrupt this process of cognitive development and what the results of such interruption might be.

Certainly, in general terms, it seems obvious that interruption of cognitive development will occur whenever the messages needed by the child are not available to him in quantity, quality, or in proper developmental sequence. In his earliest, most crucial years, the child must depend on his family for these messages. If he lives in a family which as a unit cannot provide them because all family members are not developed in this realm, he will, of course, not develop. Such has been the case in sixty to seventy percent of the families studied by our group at Wiltwyck. If he lives in a family which could provide the messages, but in which communication is so disrupted as to prevent him from receiving them, again he will not develop. If either of these conditions exist to any extent in the family of the child who moves from one culturally determined configuration of reality to another, such a move will add to the probability of an arrest in cognitive development, since many of the "integrating themes" the child as assimilated from his family and culture of origin will differ grossly or subtly from those he needs for successful adaptation and completion of the process in his new surroundings. The complications which would exist if there is also a difference in language between the two cultures are obvious.

It is even theoretically possible that some children, in whom cognitive development has proceeded within the boundaries of normality until such a move, will not yet have reached a point in their development which will allow them the flexibility to accommodate to the new configurations of reality in the new culture, and arrest in development and a kind of "cognitive decompensation" could occur. It is likely, however, that such a child already is fortunate enough to have been born into a family in which parents will absorb the impact of change and will guide their child with skill through the troubled period during which he must reorient the progression of his development.

Generally, then, it seems reasonable to suggest that one of the conditions that could be labelled social which will contribute to an arrest of cognitive development in a given child or adolescent is any set of circumstances which, in communicational terms, isolates that child from the culture in which he lives for a significant period prior to, let us say, the twelfth year of his life.

What, then, would one expect to see in the personality organization and behavior of the child or adolescent in whom this process has broken down? First, if he has not sufficiently developed concepts which will allow him to orient himself with clarity in differentiated space, one would expect to see an aimless quality in his movements, a lack of clear differentiation of himself from his surroundings, and a lack of clarity in body image. His lack of differentiated view of a variety of transactional life arenas in which different roles are played would lead one to expect his response to people in various roles with whom he comes into contact to be equally as undifferentiated.

He will not have organized his experience into categories by similarity and analogy and he will, therefore, have a poorly developed sense of the sequence of events in time. He will have little sense of his own capacity to influence events around him and thus very little sense of mastery. He will find meaning in his life only in the immediate activity in which he is involved. Thus, in order to maintain a sense that life is meaningful at all, he will seek a high level of stimuli at all times, and maintain a high level of self-stimulus through engaging in constant action. He will not be able to plan or to anticipate events, since he sees no relationship between present and future. He will often not even be able to see the relationship between his own actions and the response those actions evoke from others.

Without these capacities he will have no basis for guiding his behavior, no background against which he can choose appropriate adaptive behavior in any given situation and no way to prejudge the results his behavior will achieve or the response it will produce from others. He will not, in essence, be able to think before acting.

Having relatively few established "integrating themes" which are congruent with and rooted in societal values, institutions, and laws, he will seem devoid of knowledge of the expectations placed on him as a citizen and a member of a society. And when his sterotyped adaptive patterns do not work, he will disorganize easily, since he has few or no alternative ways of behaving. He will often seem, as a result, on the edge of despair since he sees no way of controlling his destiny, and the hopes he generates are likely to be unrealistic and doomed to repetitive failure since they must rely more on fantasy than on experience.

And, since he cannot learn or put words to use in many contexts, the richness of meaning, which words acquire through varied usage in many different life transactions where they acquire a depth and breadth of connotative nuance, will not develop for him. He is, as a result, not likely to see words as widely useable and valuable tools. Furthermore, he is not likely to develop a clear concept of himself as a user of words.

On the contrary, he will be deficient in communications skills and without motivation to acquire them. Thus, efforts to teach him these skills are likely to fail.

He will not be able to differentiate a wide variety of inner feeling responses. On the contrary, he is likely to be clearly aware only of feelings that create widespread physiological responses in him that he perceives as high level stimuli in themselves. Such emotions, of course, are primarily those of individual survival, fear and rage, or that of species survival, sexual sensation.

He will remain a restless drifter, an isolate from his better developed peers. He will tend to band with others who show the same effects of developmental arrest. He will drift with them as they collectively seek gratifications of primitive pleasure needs and high-level stimuli and activities which can provide momentary meaning to life.

This hypothetical description which, due to the time limits of this discussion is far from complete, turns out to be a description of the child of the family isolated and depressed by long-standing, relentless poverty.

If one can endow this hypothetical child-adolescent with better developed spacial concepts and somewhat better language development, he becomes the adolescent from the middle or upper class family whose cognitive development has been arrested by early breakdown in communication between himself and his parents.

And, although no such descriptive data is available about the child or adolescent whose family has moved from one culture to another, it is reasonable to suspect that, if his family are not able or willing to guide him through the difficult process of transition, he might well show many of the same characteristics of arrest and decompensation of cognitive development.

What happens to this child or adolescent or young adult? Let us place him now back in his social environment. If he comes from the undifferentiated, "disadvantaged" family he is likely to live in a neighborhood where a better differentiated peer with delinquent values is always available to organize a fighting gang, where the narcotics pusher or the illicit vendor of drugs is in open operation, or where the soap box agitator or the igniting incident amidst racial or social tensions can easily incite a mob to violence.

In his search for gratification of pleasure and survival needs and for a constantly high level of stimulus and action, he is likely to join the gang without a second thought and thus to steal, fight, engage in wanton destruction, or try out the effects of drugs. He will join in a riot with a sense of high level excitement. He is suddenly alive, man, he's moving, he's on the go. And not only that, but he's with the other cats, he's a participant, part of a group. Momentarily he has an identity. That is, until the larger society from which he has been excluded moves in to stop him.

I want to re-emphasize here that I am _not_ talking about "The Poor" or any one or more minority group. I _am_ talking about a rather large group of families and individuals who, because of long-term poverty, have been isolated from the mainstream of life in the larger society of our cities. Some of them are poor because they belong to disenfranchised minority groups. I am also talking about some middle class children who have grown up in isolation in their families, and others who, as a result of moving from one culture to another, have suffered from similar isolation. I have found it difficult to establish a dialogue about this group, the poverty group especially, with people, professionally trained or otherwise, who have not had direct experience in an arena dealing with them. People working in places populated largely by middle-class or cognitively developed lower-class people seem relatively unaware of the very existence of the group of which I speak. But with any teacher from a juvenile or family court, or any well-trained welfare worker, I have no trouble. They know the families and children of whom I speak. They struggle with them daily.

All that our society has done to this group so far, and I mean to, not with or for, is to tag them with a variety of labels. I have done this myself in this paper. I labelled them disadvantaged and cognitively undifferentiated. But at least these labels are not as institutionalized as some that are routinely used. Popular labels vary according to the arena in which a member of one of these families or the full family appear. If the arena is the courts, the label is delinquent. If the arena is the classroom, the child or adolescent is likely to wind up in a psychologist's or psychiatrist's office, where he acquires one of a variety of labels that range from mentally defective to emotionally disturbed to psychotic or schizophrenic if he is seen in a context in which he looks sufficiently disorganized. In the welfare arena, these labels also abound. To the lay person these labels convey the notion that he is either a criminal or a nut. He is, of course, neither, and he deserves some better designation. Perhaps this is the first thing that should be done for him and his family.

There is today a hopeful trend that promises to do something for this group. At long last both the public sector and, yes, by God, even the private sector of our society have become concerned with the disenfranchised people in our midst. Vast, though yet inadequate, sums of money have been made available for programs aimed at narrowing the gaps between the haves and have-nots. Within and without government in the "War On Poverty" there are a number of schools of thought as to how to do this.

There is the "opportunity" school which, oversimplifying opportunity theory, is stuck on the notion that all that is needed are available jobs and better housing. There is the group that go one step further and advocate job training programs. Then there is the group which advocates an escalation of training for untrained people - the euphemism is indigenous, if they live in the community in which they work - in neighborhood service centers. This model is designed to kill two birds with one stone because it also provides a corps of advocates for the disenfranchised. Then there is the early childhood education group out of whose work and thought Headstart arose.

What happens to the particular group about whom I am talking when and if, and this is a large if, they get involved in any one of these types of programs. Given a job and so-called good housing, those from this group have almost universally been unable to maintain their function on the job for any appreciable length of time and they have, often with startling rapidity, turned their "good" housing, into a tiny slum. In job training programs, such as the Job Corps, they simply have not assimilated the training given them within any context which gives the experience meaning. They are more attuned to the amount of money they can get by participating in such a program than any sense of progression through their own effort. They cannot conceptualize the latter, but money can be used for kicks. The individual from this group certainly never winds up in the neighborhood service center as an "indigenous" worker and seldom as a seeker of help. He cannot conceptualize what he wants help for, unless, again, it's money. At least Headstart provides an arena in which the child of the undifferentiated family is supposed to gain experience for cognitive development not available to him at home. But even when such a child does get to a Headstart program there is no system of ascertaining that he gets what he needs through a planned curriculum based on a known sequence of needed experience. Training in perceptual skills, though helpful, is not enough.

These programs are important and effective steps in the "War On Poverty." I do not wish to derogate them in any way. They can reach the majority of the economically poor, and many of the culturally impoverished. They do not, and will not, however, reach a large minority of the urban poor, whose lack of cognitive growth and differentiation have rendered them inarticulate and inaccessible by the usual channels. A whole new technology is needed if this most isolated and disenfranchised group is to be reached. They cannot be legislated or organized into participation in anything.

We are not altogether lacking in the needed technology. Some work has been done or, at least, piloted. The work of the group of which I was a part at Wiltwyck School For Boys in developing techniques of working with these undifferentiated families in a manner aimed at identifying, defining and constructing family role functions and transactions has, I think, made a contribution. Also at Wiltwyck School, Minuchin, Graubard, our chairman for today, and Chamberlain have piloted some techniques of working with games and observer-participant role changes. Bereiter et. al. have been developing some techniques by analysing the formal characteristics of language in children from this group and translating their analysis into instructional goals. The work of Vera John, from whom we will hear next, is highly relevant. The perceptual training techniques developed by Martin Deutch are very much to the point as are some of the techniques developed by Maria Montessouri. And in my own department at the Gouverneur Ambulatory Care Unit of Beth Israel Medical Center we are embarking on a pilot effort to ascertain what we can learn by a controlled study of this group using the test instruments developed by Inhelder and others in the Piagetian framework to see if the Piagetian schema can be matched with capacity for differentiated coping behavior in various life arenas. We will also be continuing to study these families in a further search for family characteristics that overtly or covertly provide integrating themes for identity development in their children that are dissonant with the demands of our society similar to those reported in our study at Wiltwyck. And, undoubtedly, there are many relevant projects of which I am unaware.

Some of the preliminary work done with teaching machines, especially the more complex computerized machines such as Moore and

Kobler's Edison Responsive Environment Machine, which can be easily programmed with fixed programs or programs individualized on the spot, offer much promise as valuable instruments with which to deliver differentiating experience to this group.

There are other techniques which have yet to be tried, which I hope to see put into operation in our work in lower Manhattan or elsewhere. The notion propounded by such organizations as the 4-H clubs and the Junior Achievement program where farmers and business men were organized to teach about what they knew best, rural life and business methods, can be put to good use in a specialized form of community organization. It should be possible as part of a total program, for example, to organize the merchants, service people, professionals, etc., in a representive block or two in a given community in such a way as to have each of these volunteers meet in their operational environment with groups of family members from undifferentiated families, simply to tell them in some structured detail precisely what they do, inclduing the role functions, specific transactions, and language germane to their particular operation. By appropriately building this experience into the sequence of a cognitive training program, it should be possible to lead groups through the process of differentiating the ingredients of a selected area of the city in some detail.

Programs helping children to organize events in time which begin with the use of blocks of various shapes and colors designed for use in teaching the concept of similarity, going on to such exercises as rhyming, and ending in exercises and trips designed for the same purpose, have already proven useful.

The teaching of values, for example, beginning with concepts of size, shape, and composition in relation to weight, and ending with the concept of weighting the importance of tenets governing behavior, can also be used.

But the welding of these techniques and others yet to be developed into a curriculum designed to develop coping skills for a minimum of necessary life arenas, thus insuring that people who lack such experience can develop the tools for participation has yet to be accomplished. Such a "curriculum for living" is badly needed.

There are those who maintain that this group cannot be reached even if they can be involved in an arena designed for the purposes I describe. The claim is that there are critical periods of growth and development that result in irreversible deficits in the neurophysiological bases for learning later. Both McV. Hunt and Martin Deutsch have expressed this view. Bruno Bettelheim has also written of his own belief that this is so. I suppose some children who have suffered from severe stimulus deficit right from the start may be permanently slow in their development. But most of the group of which I speak have not suffered from a deficit of stimuli. They have, on the contrary, been bombarded by a large variety of stimuli. The difficulty is in the structure, content, and availability of certain highly specific stimuli in the form of perceptual messages which allow for sequential assimilation and integration of these messages into cognitive structures in the process of concept development. Every effort to teach this group I have seen or heard of that has taken this notion of sequence into account has shown striking results.

The claim is also frequently made that it is not possible to involve this group. This claim is especially specious, since almost everybody in this group is already involved somewhere, either with teachers, welfare workers, or probation officers. And most of them show up in health care arenas sooner or later. The obvious implication, it seems to me, is that cooperative effort, rather than the fragmentation that one sees currently, is imperative between these agencies, in this realm especially. Cooperation such as this may seem at present a remote possibility, but it could be made a reality if organized around the "curriculum for living" of which I speak in a total community effort. Most importantly, such an effort not only could bring identity, capacity and opportunity for choices, and at least some social mobility to people who have never had any of these products of our democratic society, but it could also, from the point of view of the urban community, be a means of prevention aimed at many of its most serious problems.

Not only does it seem likely that behavior carrying the labels of crime and delinquency could be diminished, but the use of drugs including addicting drugs, and learning problems of children, should diminish. Vandalism and senseless rioting and destruction would seem less likely if the supply of readymade rioters is lessened. Such programs promote integration in its broadest sense in a community. They should be not only preventative, but enhancing.

The role of the educator in such community efforts is, of course, central. It is he who knows most about constructing curricula. It is he who knows most about the delivery of knowledge to those who need it. His curricula, however, must now be developed in close cooperation with the biological and behavioral scientist. They must span the life cycle of our species, from the womb to the grave. And he must teach his techniques of delivery to those who can use them in a large variety of helping arenas. The classroom can no longer remain his prime target. Our society is beginning to look in his direction with a challenge that is gaining form. I hope he will be prepared to meet it.

Discussant

DR. VERA JOHN, PH.D.

Ferkauf Graduate School, Yeshiva University, New York, N.Y.

It is indeed a pleasure to have the privilege of commenting on a presentation which spans all the way from communications theory to cognitive development.

This is a breadth that I am pleased with, and comfortable with, being one that parallels the development of my own thinking.

I am particularly interested in the concepts that Dr. Auerswald puts forth in the area of the relationship between messages and integrating themes. Such conceptualization is useful, it seems to me, because it cuts across some of the dichotomies that we have come to rely upon, and be so fond of. For instance, the dichotomy between attitudes and concepts. His approach does help us to look at social, intellectual and emotional development as an integrated rather than as isolated, or differentiated processes.

Similarly, I think the distinction that he has made between the sense of belonging and sense of participation is a useful one. This differentiation in cognitive terms might indicate that the child, being a receptor or an individual who is exposed to a variety of messages in his environment, as he develops further, will become an active learner and an active participant. It is this change from receptive to active learning that could be an important clue to our theories of development; and I think it is a change, or shift, that is not always as clearly made in theories of development as it might be.

Thirdly, it seemed to me that the last point made in the presentation, concerning the unduly great emphasis on "critical periods" that has been advanced by some of our most admired psychologists, such as McVee Hunt (1961) is a very important one. Though I personally do think that the preschool period is a critical stage, but preschool enrichment is not the panacea that we sometimes believe it to be.

But, I do have some critical questions that I would like to ask concerning in this presentation. That, of course, is my task. It seems to me that a distinction between personal isolation and isolation within, or by, an entire small community might be made. Not until the very end of the paper did this distinction come through. At the beginning of the paper, I was not sure whether we were speaking about the entire disadvantaged group or a large percentage of the disadvantaged group, and whether the concept of personal isolation, and community isolation, were fused. There are, significant integrating themes in the lives of the children raised in poverty. However, these integrating themes, prepare them for adaptation that is different from that necessary to be successful in the public schools, as they are presently constituted. And, therefore, it isn't necessarily lack of cognitive development that we are faced with; but cognitive development that is not optimally congruent with the demands of the public school system. The reliance upon cognitive theory, as a tool by means of which we want to explain most of the problems faced in our low income groups, may therefore lead us to some very, very serious problems.

In view of this, I think Piaget and many others committed the serious mistake of developing a theory of cognition based on a small number of middle class children. That theory cannot adequately handle the questions of learning and adaptation in an environment significantly different, from those in which he raised his own children, and most of us raise ours.

The question of "identity definition" becomes of concern to me, too. Can we only have "identity definition" as expressed in the elaborated code of Bernstein? Or is it possible to develop identity via group membership, not simply group membership in the classroom, but group membership in the various and varied forms of family and community living, in the communities of the poor? Indeed so - I think that we do observe these forms of identity being developed in some of our communities of the poor, forms which are in need of much more careful examination and study on the part of the behavioral scientists. We will learn something about the cognitive processes involved in a non-middle class communication, in a non-middle class group belonging, and a non-middle class language, only by examining these forms of group identity.

And, lastly, I think that the reliance upon some of the concepts put forth this morning about the lack of organized experience that some disadvantaged children are exposed to, might be helpful in specifying, when working with larger groups of disadvantaged children, which of them do need individual help, individual treatment, individual personal relationship between teacher and child. Very often, these children might come from homes where the mother is an ADC mother who herself has become isolated from her total community; where she has conveyed that sense of isolation and despair to her own children. These children, then, might be in need of a very different reconstruction, or different approach, than the majority of young disadvantaged children and teenagers and adults that we work with.

In summary, then, I think that we might want to differentiate between concepts of cognitive development and concepts of cultural or socially-determined development. I don't mean that these are not interrelated. But I think that the cognitive development, to a considered degree, is a reflection of the social conditions in which a child lives, and is not necessarily the determinant thereof. Therefore, it seems to me, it is necessary, first, to carefully examine the social and cultural context of the life of any child with whom we work, and then look at its cognitive consequences; instead of "looking backwards", at the cognitive deficiencies a child may possess, and from this point of view, attempt to define the social and cultural environment from which he came.

4090

An Empirical-Experimental Approach to the Nature and Remediation of Conduct Disorders of Children[1]

HERBERT C. QUAY
University of Illinois, Chicago, Ill.

In this presentation I will try to discuss both the development of a conceptual system for the classification of children's behavior problems and what appears to be the most promising approach to the modification of these problems in the school setting. I hope to show that an empirically based classification system has important implications for remediational programs and that the assessment of children within the framework of such a system is a necessary and first step in the remediational process.

The Structure of Children's Behavior Disorders

Our basic assumption about the nature of children's behavior disorders is that they can be viewed most profitably in terms of the specific behaviors themselves and in terms of intercorrelated constellations of these behaviors rather than in terms of either deviant personality types or disease entities. This viewpoint suggests that there are dimensions of deviant or discordant behavior along which all children will vary. The child whose behavior has come to be extreme on one or more of these dimensions is the child who is likely to become known as an emotionally disturbed or behavior problem child.

Considerable research has been devoted to the delineation of these basic intercorrelated constellations, syndromes or dimensions of problem behavior. Over the past few years there have appeared a number of studies in which multivariate statistical procedures have been applied to data obtained by a variety of methods from samples of problem behavior children in many different settings.

---

[1] The research described herein was supported by a grant (MH-07346) from the National Institutes of Health, U.S.Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

These studies have sampled children who are clients of child guidance clinics, (Hewitt & Jenkins, 1946; Patterson, 1964) inmates of correctional institutions, (Peterson, Quay & Tiffany, 1961; Quay, 1964a Quay, 1964b;Quay, 1966) students in regular classes in the public schools (Peterson, 1961; Quay & Quay, 1965) and students in special classes for the emotionally disturbed (Quay, Morse & Cutler, 1966). Data have been collected by means of analysis of case histories, the direct ratings of behavior, the responses to personality questionnaires, and combinations of all three methods.

Beginning with the pioneering work of Hewitt and Jenkins,(1946) a considerable degree of consistency of results has emerged. The majority of the variance of a vast number of both directly observed problem behavior traits and questionnaire items related to problem behavior can usually be accounted for by four orthogonal factorial dimensions. These factors have been called 1) the conduct disorder, unsocialized-aggressive or psychopathy; 2) the personality disorder, overinhibited or neurotic-disturbed; 3) the socialized or subcultural delinquent; and 4) the inadequate or immature child.

The unsocialized-aggressive syndrome routinely contains behavioral elements of active hostility, defiance, cruelty, aggression, attention- seeking, boisterousness, uncooperativeness, disruptiveness, and many other like characteristics.

The personality problem or neurotic syndrome generally encompasses the behavior traits of shyness, seclusiveness, apathy, aloofness, reticence, withdrawal, anxiety, inferiority and lack of confidence.

The socialized delinquent syndrome is somewhat different in that it is composed of behavior traits such as truancy, engaging in gang activities, cooperative stealing, associating with delinquent companions, but does not contain behavioral elements suggesting either subjective psychological distress or a fundamental disruption of interpersonal relationships. This cluster of behaviors seems to relate to "delinquent" or acting-out behavior more as an adaptive than a maladaptive mechanism.

The syndrome called inadequacy-immaturity almost always accounts for much less of a variance than the prior three factors and its interpretation is consequently less clear. Most frequently it is made up of the traits of daydreaming, distractibility, inability to cope, inattention, preoccupation, and laziness Some of the elements of this syndrome are suggestive of the constellation of behaviors frequently thought to be associated with what has been called minimal cerebral dysfunction Parenthetically, I should like to note that we are currently engaged in a cooperative research project involving intensive neurological studies of a group of about 60 children which should shed some light on this possibility.

At present it is possible to measure the degree to which any child manifests each of these problem behavior dimensions by the use of a problem behavior checklist, a checklist for the analysis of life history data and, for children with the reading ability, a personality questionnaire. In the operation of our own experimental class for conduct disorder children we give considerable emphasis to the problem behavior checklist as it is filled out by teachers and parents as a basic diagnostic tool.

General Concepts of Remediation

Before discussing the particular implications of these problem behavior dimensions for the remediational process I should like to spend a minute or two outlining the general concepts of remediation with which my colleagues and I are currently experimenting in a special class setting and which we feel holds a great deal of promise for effectiveness in the public school setting.

We consider the proper focus of attention in remediation to be on maladaptive behaviors which are seen primarily as the result of the prior learning experiences of the child. Thus it follows that remediation should be based on the application of the principles of learning theory as these principles may interact with and be influenced by the behavioral characteristics of the child. The aim is to bring about the elimination of inappropriate behavior and to substitute for them adaptable alternative behaviors. There is now considerable evidence from both laboratory studies (Bandura & Walters, 1963) and from field experiments (Zimmerman & Zimmerman, 1962; Azran & Lindsley, 1966; Patterson, Jones, Whittier & Wright, 1965) that maladaptive behavior in children can be modified in a variety of situations by the direct manipulation of stimulus conditions and response-reinforcement contingencies involve the judicious use of reward and punishment at an appropriate point in time. There are two important principles in the use of reward and punishment in behavior modification. The first is that the reinforcement should come immediately after the target behavior is emitted if it is going to be most effective in increasing the probability that that behavior will again be emitted. This principle of immediate contingency is one of the most crucial factors in behavior modification but seems to remain one of the least appreciated by those working with children. A second point is that what is rewarding and what is punishing may at times be quite idiosyncratic to the child in question and it may require considerable skill to find reinforcers which are effective with a particular child.

Thus to be successful in behavior modification one must organize the environment in such a way that deviant and disagreeable responses go unreinforced and are thus subject to extinction while adaptive behavior receives immediate and generally continuous reinforcement.

The Implication of the Dimensions of Problem Behavior for the Remediational Process

Basically the implications are twofold and concern what should be taught (the content) and how it should be taught (the method). Since we are concerned here with the acting-out child I will limit this part of the discussion to the unsocialized-aggressive and socialized delinquent syndrome.

Recent research has indicated that social reinforcers such as praise and other verbalizations are relatively weaker in effect on individuals who represent extremes of the unsocialized-aggressive behavior syndrome. (Johns & Quay, 1962; Levin & Simmons, 1962; Quay & Hunt, 1965). It therefore appears that in the early stages of retraining the conduct disorder child it may be necessary to utilize reinforcers of a concrete nature such as candy, trinkets and toys. However, the dispensing of more primary rewards ought deliberately to be paired with social reinforcers such as praise, smiles and approving gestures, to facilitate the development of responsivity to the more usual social reinforcers.

Another facet of the nature of the highly unsocialized or psychopathic individual lies in the realm of the responsivity of the nervous system of such individuals to external stimulation. It does appear that some of the overt aggressive behavior of such individuals may be motivated in part by an inability to tolerate routine and boredom. I have suggested elsewhere (Quay, 1965) that the behavior of psychopathic individuals may represent an extreme of stimulation-seeking behavior and thus it follows that variety in the nature of stimulus inputs may be a reinforcing event for these kinds of individuals. Thus, sudden switches in activity, the use of activities which have a high novelty value, and the introduction of a certain amount of uncertainty into the situation may be used as reinforcers for these individuals.

In dealing with the acting-out child one also needs to be aware that aggressive behavior carries a high potential for modelling. As we have pointed out previously (Quay, Werry, McQueen & Sprague,1966) it seems important as a practical point to increase the size of a class containing conduct problem children slowly to insure that the teacher can maintain control of the group situation. In this way examples of acceptable behaviors are available for modelling by the incoming child as well as the maladaptive aggressive behaviors so frequently displayed by these children.

The socialized delinquent child present somewhat different features. Here we have a situation where there is considerable reason to believe that the peer group has been the primary source of reinforcement. The behaviors which have been learned by the socialized-delinquent child have likely been learned through reinforcements delivered by peers rather than by parents. Our problem here is to substitute other reinforcers for the approval of peers or to manipulate the entire group so that in turn they will tend to reinforce more appropriate behaviors of each others. It appears that one common mistake that has been made in the approach in working with groups of socialized delinquents has been the tendency for workers to unwittingly reinforce the very behavior which they are trying to extinguish. In attempting to control behavior delinquency prevention workers frequently use very concrete rewards: money, recreational trips, mediational services with police and schools, etc. It is certainly true that these sorts of actions on the part of workers take some reinforcement out of the hands of peers but there seems to have been an unfortunate tendency for workers to make these rewards contingent upon delinquent behavior rather than upon constructive behavior.

In working with the socialized delinquent child it seems most important to create a highly organized environment in which most reinforcers are taken out of the hands of peers. It seems likely that the "values" of the group may be manipulated by making group rewards sometimes contingent upon acceptable behavior on the part of individual members. This seems likely to bring group pressure to bear in bringing about acceptable rather than deviant behavior.

Examples of Empirical Attempts to Deal with Specific Problems in the Special Class Setting

In our early observations of the pupils in our own experimental special class we were impressed by the very poor attending behavior of our children. While we were attempting to maximize attending behaviors by some individual instruction and individually programmed material we also felt that if we were ever to rehabilitate our children to a sufficient degree that they could return to a normal classroom there was merit in attempting systematically to train the children in attending to the teacher and group instructional situations.

In an attempt to increase the attending behavior of our children we devised a situation in which reinforcement could be silently and unobtrusively delivered to an individual child if he had kept his eyes as instructed on the teacher during a given period of time. Each child was observed serially for a ten-second interval for a total of 15 such intervals during each experimental session. These observations were carried out at the same time each day and at the same activity (listening to a story). Prior to the instituting of reinforcement, observation was carried out over a period of 12 days to obtain a baseline. These observations indicated that both between and within subject variation was large but with the mean for the group was slightly over 6 out of a possible total of 15. This meant that on the average the children were fully attentive to the teacher in only six out of 15 ten-second periods during which each was observed.

At the end of the baseline period a box containing a light which could be flashed on by the experimenter was placed on each child's desk. The children were told that if they were paying attention to the teacher their light would go on from time to time and that at the end of the story period they would receive one piece of candy for each time the light had flashed. From a technical point of view, the reinforcement of the orienting behavior is on a fixed ratio schedule of 1 to 5. This would be predicted to result in greater resistance of the behavior to extinction after acquisition but to require a much larger number of learning trials for acquisition. It was hoped that the advantage of our being able to condition six children at once would outweigh the disadvantage of more trials resulting from the intermittent reinforcement schedules. The mean of the last 20 trials of reinforcement was between 12 and 13. At that point, the children were told that they would no longer receive candy for having paid attention but that their score would still be taken and would be announced at the end of the period. Since our teacher was afraid that the removal of all reinforcement would institute considerable deterioration in behavior she substituted a pat on the head for each point earned for the previous candy reward. We then ran 35 trials under this condition which we called social reinforcement. The mean for the last 20 trials under this condition was slightly less than 12. At that point we dropped out all mention of candy, points, pats on the head, or anything else and put the children on complete extinction. This part of the experiment is still under way; we shall report the details of this study in a more formal way at a later date.

The fact that most special classes for the emotionally disturbed necessarily contain children at various levels of academic achievement presents serious problems in group instruction. One way of mitigating this problem somewhat is to provide some individual instruction for those children so deficient in basic academic skills as to limit their participation in various phases of the group instruction. We have attempted this primarily with reading using programmed instructional methods coupled with immediate concrete reinforcement. In one instance, a six year old child of average ability acquired the alphabet in approximately 12 ten minute sessions spread over about two weeks. In the course of this procedure, it was also possible to shift from primary reinforcers (candy) delivered immediately and on a continuous or 1:1 basis to a symbolic reward (poker chips) to be traded for a concrete reward (candy) at a later time (lunch hour) on a ratio of 4 correct responses for 1 reward. Thus, at the same time reading was being taught, the child was also being taught (1) to work for symbolic rewards, (11) to delay gratification and (111) to work on intermittent reinforcement schedule-- three characteristics which must be developed if the emotionally disturbed child is to participate ultimately in the regular school program. After acquiring the alphabet this child began a phonically oriented programmed series during the course of which he was switched to social reinforcement. His reading instruction is now taking place in a regular class adjacent to our special classroom.

Group vs Individual Techniques

The economics of public schools obviously require the development of techniques that will allow children to be handled in a group situation by as few adults as possible. Most of the techniques of behavioral remediation have been developed for use on an individual basis and it seems crucial at this stage to attempt to extend these techniques to group situations. This is a problem to which we are most seriously addressing ourselves, since even if the techniques of behavior remediation should prove to be very highly effective when applied on an individual basis, they are nevertheless likely to remain economically unfeasible unless they can be adapted for use in a group setting such as the classroom.

The Goals of the Special Class

While it is probably unrealistic in the case of every child, the goal of the special class should be to reintegrate its pupils into the regular class system. Special classes tend to be, partly as a result of legal restrictions, better staffed and also often better equipped than regular classes. This can easily lead to the development of what can be called "hot house" techniques and standards of behavior. This is probably both necessary and useful initially in shaping the child's behavior to approximate to the norm, but regular class oriented procedures such as group rather than individual instruction and a decreasing tolerance for deviant behavior must ultimately be instituted preferably by successive approximation.

Role of the Techniques of the Special Class in the Regular Class

A final but certainly no less important point is that techniques developed in the special class setting should ideally have some general applicability in the regular classroom. In the last analysis, the aim should be that of prevention rather than that of remediation. Techniques should be developed to prevent children from becoming discordant enough in their behavior to warrant special class placement. The special class should see itself not only as a remediational setting, but also as a laboratory in which techniques for teaching adaptive behavior in a group setting can be developed and then communicated to teachers in the regular class system.

References

Azrin, H. H. & Lindsley, O. R. The reinforcement of cooperation between children. *Journal Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1956, *52*, 100-102.

Bandura, A. & Walters R. L. *Social learning and personality development*. New York: Holt, 1963.

Hewitt, L. E. & Jenkins, R. L. *Fundamental patterns of maladjustment, the dynamics of their origin.* Springfield: State of Illinois, 1946.

Johns, J. H. & Quay, H. C. The effect of social reward on verbal conditioning in psychopathic and neurotic military offenders. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1962, *26*, 217-220.

Levin, G. R. & Simmons, J. J. Response to food and praise by emotionally disturbed boys. *Psychological Reports*, 1962, *11*, 539-546.

Patterson, G. R. An empirical approach to the classification of disturbed children. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1964, *20*, 326-337.

Patterson, G. R., Jones, R., Whittier, J. & Wright, Mary A. A behavior modification technique for the hyperactive child. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 1965, *2*, 217-226.

Peterson, D. R. Behavior problems of middle childhood. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1961, *25*, 205-209.

Peterson, D. R., Quay, H. C. & Tiffany, T. L. Personality factors related to juvenile delinquency. *Child Development*, 1961, *32*, 355-372.

Quay, H. C. Personality dimensions in delinquent males as inferred from the factor analysis of behavior ratings. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 1964a, *1*, 33-37.

Quay, H. C. Dimensions of personality in delinquent boys as inferred from the factor analysis of case history data. *Child Development*, 1964b, *35*,479-484.

Quay, H. C. Psychopathic personality as pathological stimulation seeking. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1965, *122*, 180-183.

Quay, H. C. Personality patterns in preadolescent delinquent boys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1966, *26*, 99-110.

Quay, H. C. & Hunt, W. A. Psychopathy, neuroticism and verbal conditioning: A replication and extension. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 1965. *29*, 283.

Quay, H. C., Morse, W. C. & Cutler, R. L. Personality patterns of pupils in special classes for the emotionally disturbed. *Exceptional Childre* 1966, *32*, 297-301.

Quay, H. C. & Quay, Lorene C. Behavior problems in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 1965, 36, 215-220.

Quay, H. C., Werry, J. S., McQueen, Marjorie & Sprague, R. L. Remediation of the conduct problem child in the special class setting. Exceptional Children, 1966, 32, 509-515.

Zimmerman, Elaine H. & Zimmerman, J. The alteration of behavior in a special classroom situation. Journal of Experimental Analysis of Behavior, 1962, 5, 59-60.

Discussant

DR. BLUMA WEINER, ED.D.
Ferkauf Graduate School, Yeshiva University, New York, N.Y.

I think there has been very wide acknowledgment that a kiss on the wrist is quite continental, but it takes real science and talent to determine the worth of a pat on the head. I also think that Dr. Quay has done a rather special service here this morning, a three-pronged one. First, he has assisted in formulating more precise terminology and, therefore, more precise thinking. If we use the term "conduct disorder" as it has been described behaviorally it enables us to bring into manageable segments certain kinds of problems. It not only enables the adult to bring these segments into manageability, but possibly also the child involved.

The generally broad global concepts of behavior and global terminology such as "emotionally disturbed" which many of us have struggled with, seem almost impenetrable. It's hard to get inside a globe; it seems to have no beginning or no end. By latching on to a rather specific aspect of behavior, describing it, cutting it to size as it were, Dr. Quay has enabled us to appreciate the second service he has done, and that is to dispel the "mystique" or illusionist attitude about children with conduct disorders. The job is difficult enough as it is. There are enough unknowns without any artificial haloes, esoteric mysteries or what-not, about working with disturbed, retarded, or acting-up children.

The third service he has done is to help us ascertain more precisely the roles of school and of teachers. He also did a very neat job in pointing out to other professional colleagues what he expected them to be able to do in the way of providing teachers with rather specific and precise guidelines and principles.

The portion of his presentation which held particular interest for me was his discussion of the reinforcers. We need to take a long look at some of our naive notions of rewards and punishment, especially punishment. In some groups the idea of giving kids candy or a toy (not your flashlight, you may need it again) or some other tangible reinforcement, may prove somewhat shocking. Particularly in public school settings, gift giving has been regarded as somewhat on the order of a bribe rather than as a coolly calculated plan for attracting interest and cooperation, and ultimately developing a different sense of values. We have projected our own purposes upon kids, perhaps projected our own values and reinforced the idea that to give anything of any substance was automatically a bribe, rather than a legitimate way of serving some other kind of purpose.

I would think, in connection with work with these children and with children in general, that we need to review something of the philosophies and theories of punishment: the concept of deterrent, the concept of restitution, and the concept of revenge. Punishment as restitution and revenge has been completely worthless. With respect to the business of deterrence, or modification of behavior, I think the reason that we've failed there has simply been that we haven't been using it correctly, or appropriately. Dr. Quay's suggestions for the appropriate use of reinforcers, some of which may be painful or uncomfortable, or inconvenient, and thus may be thought of as some form of punishment, need another look.

I think it would have been a little more useful if, in the beginning Dr. Quay had told us that he was working with comparatively young children. I would be very much interested in knowing his thinking with respect to the application of some of these same notions and principles with children whose life experience has been longer, who have perhaps already adapted, adopted and established certain value systems about which they're quite articulate, and which may -- and which do pose some very special concern to us.

It's rather interesting that just within the past week the American Educational Research Association, in cooperation with classroom Teachers Association, has produced their Pamphlet No. 32 on controlling classroom misbehavior. It deals with material, in a somewhat attentuated way, along the lines of the discussion which Dr. Quay has presented to us. My final comment is simply this: Dr. Quay has described what is presently an experimental classroom, and the nature of the experiment has required certain setups and additional personnel, and close scrutiny and controls. I think, from my reading of his paper, and following his comments, that he'll be able to develop this into a model of behavioral management that will be more widely adapt - and feasible in public school settings. And to keep my closing comments still on the general theme, I will simply say that, borrowing from what I'm sure is a very expensive ad that I noticed in the subway, perhaps all it really takes is a little cash and a lot of courage.

4097

The Urban School and the Delinquent[1]

WILLIAM C. KVARACEUS
Tufts University, Medford, Mass.

In the rural America that Booth Tarkington described, Penrod viewed school "as a place of confinement envenomed by mathematics." This now has been modernized, and to mathematics has been added a good dose of science, language, and literature. In the urbanized America of Salinger's Holden Caulfield, the neurotic version of the middle-class delinquent complains: "They give guys the axe frequently at Pencey. It has a very good academic reputation, Pencey. It really does."

It is true that many schools are saving their academic reputations by selling the reluctant and recalcitrant learners down the river. Writing of his own inner-city school experience, James Baldwin confides:

> School began to reveal itself, therefore, as a child's game that one could not win, and boys dropped out and went to work. My father wanted me to do the same. I refused, even though I no longer had any illusions about what an education could do for me.

Many city youngsters who become delinquent come to school lacking any poker chips with which to enter the classroom game, and those who drop out must face perennial unemployment. Children and youth who live in the big city and who attend schools in crowded urban centers tend to be more exposed, vulnerable, or susceptible to social inadaptation and delinquency, according to a number of recent studies reported in many countries including the U.S.A.

---

[1] This paper has been drawn from a forthcoming volume, Anxious Youth: Dynamics of Delinquency, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., to be published in the summer of 1966. The paper was presented at the Fifth Annual Invitational Conference on Urban Education, Ferkauf Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva University, New York City, May 3, 1966.

Evidence of the delinquent gang as a fast-growing social, urban institution is provided in the French investigations by Ceccaldi[2], who reports that in the period between 1950 and 1958 a 124% increase in gang delinquencies was noted in cities of more than 100,000 population, whereas cities with less than 50,000 showed only a 28% increase for the same period. A finer breakdown of figures for small and large communities reaffirmed a significant correlation between gang delinquency and the factors of compressed and industrialized areas, although the correlation does not represent a straight-line relationship.

In a controlled follow-up study of delinquents in Finland, Saari[3] has reported that the recidivists included the highest proportion of moving individuals and also that such persons tended to move to more densely populated districts. The city drew them like a magnet.

In a Norwegian study by Christie[4] in which 1,000 young offenders were compared with a sample of their nondelinquent counterparts, it was noted that two thirds of the offenders had no education beyond a minimal level. Yet the offenders lived in the densely populated parts of the country where there was easy access to extended education and better schools. It was also noted that school achievement and marks were considerably lower for the offenders. Christie presses home the fact that since the school agency has taken over many of the functions of the family in modern, industrialized Norwegian society, these differences in school background between offenders and nonoffenders become a matter of special reference in view of the similar home and family backgrounds from which the groups came.

In Poland in 1962[5], I found the current rate of delinquency per 1,000 boys 10-17 years of age to be 5. 1 in the rural areas. But in cities of less than 50,000, it was 14.4 per thousand; and in the very large cities over 50,000 it soared to 22.9 per thousand. Almost half of all Polish delinquents - 44.2% - resided in cities of more than 50,000 which contained only 24.5% of the population of Poland.

In the United States trouble with pupils and sheer bigness of educational enterprise seem to go hand in hand. The National Education Association in a study of pupil misbehavior noted[6] that teachers in big school districts, in big schools, and big classes reported significantly more trouble with pupils than teachers in small districts, in small schools, and with small classes. This was one of the most definite relationships established in the study.

The big-city slant in juvenile delinquency is further accentuated by an annual report made by the Illinois Youth Commission[7]. In this state the 14 counties in which the principle industrial and urban centers are located were found to be the feeders for 91% of all boys committed in a single year to the state training school.

These research studies explicitly reaffirm the greater vulnerability, exposure, and opportunity for delinquency and social inadaption of young city dwellers; implicitly, they underscore the schools responsibility and opportunity as the one agency that constantly comes in contact with the city child and is in a strong position to assist him in his growth and adjustment.

For the many city children who come from disrupted and unstable homes, who live in neighborhoods lacking cohesiveness, whose value systems are in conflict with those of the dominant adult community, whose parents are ignorant or neglectful, who find no moral, social, or psychological roots in the neighborhood, the school generally represents the one positive and supervised experience that can steer them in the direction of personal and social well-being. The school has a singular opportunity to turn youthful energies, often pointed in destructive fashion to self and society, toward more wholesome ends. In this paper, I shall discuss the school, first, as an ego-destroying agency and, second, as an ego-supporting institution.

THE SCHOOL AS AN EGO-DESTROYING INSTITUTION

The urban pupil who enters the big-city school can find there a barren and empty classroom hell which in time becomes the accepted thing. Accepting their classroom hell as a way of life, hell is the only thing the youngsters can react to. I am not concerned with the lower regions of classroom hell populated by those students who are scratching, even cheating, their way into prestige colleges via "The Fourth R-- the Rate Race," as described by John Holt in last Sunday's (May 1, 1966) New York Times Magazine. That is perhaps an even more complex problem than delinquency.

Children in a big city who enter the public schools in heavily populated neighborhoods are immediately absorbed in a massive educational system. Although the big-city school system accepts all children, it does so on its own terms. These terms frequently demand some renunciation of differences - personal, social, and cultural - and a constant submission to the processes of conformity and standardization. Most schools achieve their goals at the price of some loss of privacy, personal identity, and individuality. They require a submission to external controls and to the pressures of the group; they invoke the severe competitive processes of selection and survival of the academically fit; and all too frequently they produce an artificial separation between the classroom and the life stream of everyday problems and activities.

These demands of the large-city school system may be destructive to the ego. Children and youth who are unable or unwilling to submit frequently join the ranks of the school failures, the troubled and troublesome, the truants, and the early school dropouts. They may even set up their own ego-supporting institutions in the form of the juvenile gang.

The destructive nature of the school experiences of many delinquents and socially inadapted youngsters shows up vividly in a member of comparative studies of delinquents and their nondelinquent counterparts. School case histories of delinquents reveal them to be most often in bad school posture or in bankruptcy. Their school reports indicate low achievement or failure in many subjects. They are over-age for their grade. They register a strong dislike for school and the people who manage them. They are frequently truant. They intend to leave school as soon as the law will allow. In short, while they represent a headache for the school, the school represents an even greater headache for them. There is little evidence of status, prestige, success, security, or acceptance in the school experiences of most delinquents. What these school experiences point to is a succession of failures and sever frustrations that beget aggression toward self or toward society.

In our study of summer riots at Hampton Beach, New Hampshire, in 1965, the subjects were queried concerned their school experiences. Both those who were arrested and those who were not rated education as something highly valued. Both groups appeared to express a basic truth which had been reduced via repetition to a courteous banality. However, those who were arrested perceived themselves as having been unmotivated in school. Very few youngsters, particularly among the arrested, claimed that they had been challenged or that they had ever worked hard in school. The arrested group were also much more sensitized and conscious of changes in beach rules and regulations, to business management, and to the police patrols; and they testified to a considerable amount of stress engendered by the school.

The youngster who is most in need of help and reinforcement by the school agency is precisely the one who is most liable to reject school or to be rejected by the school. How to keep such city youngsters in school to the benefit of themselves and society should be of major concern to authorities in large urban centers. There is some evidence, for example, in the study of pupil misbehavior by the National Education

Association, that the school staff is inclined to relieve itself of the inadapted or delinquent pupil by early rejection or dismissal. In this study, almost half of the teachers and principals argued for the early expulsion of misbehaving children as a means of coming to grips with the problem. This is merely evasion. What can be done to help the city child through the school agency?

THE SCHOOL AS AN EGO-SUPPORTING INSTITUTION

Horace once stated: "No one lives content with his condition" - and, of course, the failing student least of all. Failure for the student drives home a deep awareness of limitations, and this is a condition that is not acceptable. The school cannot assume or demand compliance or resignation to failure. In doing something about it, the student may resort to fantasy or to direct action via violence or vandalism. Insurance underwriters report that the juvenile firebug's targets most frequently include schools and churches. If the school is not burned down, it's windows are pockmarked - mute evidence of discontent. Replacement of windows in Boston school buildings last year totaled a record of $108,000. The deputy of the School Building Department has already estimated that "the damages for this year will exceed $140,000, if the present pace continues." But what of the fantasies? These may be even more frightening to contemplate than the vandalisms!

The most direct and effective way to strengthen the school as an ego-supporting institution is to upgrade the interpersonal relationships between teacher and students. It is the teacher who generally enjoys the most intimate and continuing relationship with the child outside the home and family circle. Through the powerful instrument of this relationship, the teacher can do much to promote, via the normal educational processes, better mental health and emotional growth. To achieve this he must be a mature adult, committed to his responsibility of helping children and youth, and present a positive image with which to identify.

Many pupils from within the inner city, however, come to regard their teachers as phonies and frauds. Unless the teacher is secure in his subject matter, unless he himself lives out the objectives and goals toward which he is leading his pupils, and unless he is truly accepting and respecting of his pupils as persons, he will never develop a relationship that will provide the hero model with whom a pupil might identify. "Who wants to be like you?" is not an easy question for any teacher to answer.

Every teacher faces the same basic problem. He must define and maintain his role as a mature professional. Teachers in a big-city school system usually operate in a cumbersome bureaucracy. Surrounded by administrators, supervisors, and specialists, they often become uncertain of their own functions and the extent and direction of their own responsibility. Of particular significance is the National Education Association study on pupil misbehavior indicating that a substantially larger proportion of teachers in large school districts than teachers in small school districts felt that they lacked the rights and authority needed to maintain effective control over pupils.[8] This same study found that those teachers who felt that they had the necessary authority did have better-behaved pupils and fewer troublemakers in their classes.

It may well be that teachers in larger school districts, as compared with those in smaller districts, are less likely to have an important voice in determining the discipline policies of their school. Consideration should be given to including teachers of larger school units in any discussions related to policies and practices for handling problems of school discipline and social inadaptation.

On a subliminal level, teachers constantly face the problem of resolving conflicts arising between their school-organization role and their teacher-helper role. The organization commitment pulls in the direction of the enforcement and maintenance of standards of achievement, of speech, dress, and behavior; but the teacher-helper commitment demands assistance for the young learner in terms of his basic needs within the reality setting of his milieu.

For example, in assisting the slow learner or near-failure, the teacher-helper provides the pupil with individual instruction and emotional support, but at the end of the marking period, the organization role may force the teacher to fail the pupil in spite of the learning effort expended or the extenuating circumstances of the pupil's learning difficulties. Such a situation may lead to hostility directed at the very pupil the teacher has been trying to help, but who also precipitated the role conflict. In working with socially inadapted youth in particular, the teacher must be conscious of the problems he faces in experiencing this type of role conflict.

Many teachers in big-city systems today indicate strong job dissatisfaction and low self-concept, which often tend to reduce their frustration tolerance. It is difficult to tell whether the figures on pupil misbehavior in big schools and big districts reflect, in fact, a true difference in the incidence of social inadaptation between big-city pupils and small-city pupils or whether they merely reflect significant differences between irritability levels of city teachers and teachers employed in smaller schools and smaller communities. The fact is that many teachers today appear in an angry and hostile mood. This is especially manifest in the teacher's relationship with the reluctant and recalcitrant learners. The frequent cry for sterner and harsher measures in dealing with these pupils and for their removal from the regular classroom or exclusion from school would indicate that many educators are now more concerned with the reputation of their institutions than with the welfare and well-being of the offending students.

Some teachers unconsciously fear their disturbed or disturbing pupils and resent their presence in the classroom. In relating to these children, the teacher may find forgotten fears of the past suddenly unlatched by a chance remark or episode. These unresolved threats and hidden anxieties can blind and deafen the teacher to classroom realities or they can paralyze him temporarily. Sensing the precipitant of this recall process, the teacher may strike back at the pupil, using him as a symbol of the earlier offender. At times, the teacher may also try to work out or resolve his old problems through the problem behavior of his students.

In most classrooms, the cognitive aspects of life experience and the learning process are played up and the emotional aspects are played down. We understress the emotional life of the pupil until his difficulties are so pronounced that this dimension can no longer be denied.

The teacher generally does not trust emotions - his own or those of his pupils. He only seeks to repress or ignore them.

The major problem that all youth face is how to cope with adults (teachers and principals in schools and classrooms.) The major task of most pupils at all grade levels is to please the teacher or, to state it negatively, not to displease him. There are many ways to displease the teacher: failing to do your homework, speaking disrespectfully, acting too grown-up, asking too many questions, wanting to know all the answers.

In this one-sided classroom encounter between pupil and teacher in the big-city school, the young learner is ultimately forced either to submit, to retreat and regress, or to put up a fight and perhaps rebel. The rebellion can easily take the delinquency route. Delinquent behavior, often a precocious form of adult behavior, evokes fear, complaint, and retaliation from adults in school and classroom. Teachers who are accepting and unafraid of their pupils will not submerge them, but will allow them the freedom to live and to learn. This will demand teachers who have an authentic look and sound. Since failure and dislike for schoolwork are characteristic of many delinquents, and since the delinquent often show little capacity to work toward deferred educational goals, the school should provide immediate reward for effort. This can be achieved (1) if the school can implement the supermarket principle based on the theory that the more the pupil has to choose from, the more likely he is to discover what he needs and likes, and (2) if the school can dissect learning into small units based on the students' need for success -

the success principle serving as failure prevention. The hard standardization of classroom tasks and the limitations of personal choice in courses of study unnecessarily limit individual choice and personal expression. At the same time, careful segmentation of educational tasks, best illustrated in the frames of programmed instruction, renders each lesson a manageable task for the student. If the youngster is not deterred constantly in speaking and writing by demands for grammatical excellence and if the inputs are not clogged by a deluge of course material, the classroom can provide experience in learning without a constant experience in failure.

L'ENVOI

The large urban communities did not invent the delinquent and the socially inadapted child. The fact remains, however, that city schools now hold - and are likely to continue to hold - the largest segment of a nation's disturbed and disturbing youth population. In helping these youngsters to achieve academic success and find more acceptable modes of adjustment, municipal authorities will need to work more and more through the schools and classrooms; the most effective and economical way to help youth is by making good schools better schools. This, in turn, will call for teachers who are more effective as persons and as professionals.

Writing in the introduction to August Aichorn's much reprinted Wayward Youth, Freud referred to the "three impossible professions." "In my youth," he stated, "I accepted it as a byword that the three impossible professions are teaching, healing, and governing..."

At no time in American history has teaching appeared more impossible than now- whether in affluent suburbia or within the disadvantaged inner city or rural community. The American ideal or dream - perhaps even the American complex - of a compulsory classroom containing every man's child and somehow promising educational growth and attainment for all youngsters, including disadvantaged, disengaged, delinquent, and disturbed, is now being tested out as fantasy or reality.

There is much more that teachers can do to make it a better reality.

FOOTNOTES

2. Ceccaldi, M. "LA Phenomene des Bandes." Revue Penitentaire et de Droit Penal. April - June, 1961
3. Saari, E. "Delinquency as a Symptom of later Social Maladjustment." Acta Academiae Paedogogica Jyvaskyloensis, VI.Jyvaskyla: Jyvaskyian Yliopistoyhdistyksen Kustantama, 1951
4. Christie, N. Ung Norske Lovovertredere. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.
5. Vatavia M. Paper presented at International Center for Childhood, Paris, France, December, 1961
6. National Education Association, "Teacher Opinion on Pupil Behavior, 1955- 1956." Research Bulletin, 34, April, 1956
7. Illinois Youth Commission. Biennial Report of the Youth Commission, 1957-1958, Springfield, 1959
8. National Education Association, "Teacher Opinion on Pupil Behavior, 1955-1956." Research Bulletin, 34, April, 1956

Discussant

MR. RHODY McCOY
New York City Board of Education

There was mention of the school as being an ego-destroying institution as well as possibly an ego-building institution. It's quite a job to overcome the detrimental aspect as well as to try to implement the positive aspect. There were two very important aspects of this discussion that I would like to address myself to.

One is the teacher. Now, I can't, from my experience, give enough importance to the role of the teacher. What we need to do is to assist the teachers in many, many aspects, and I'd like to start with the teacher training institutions. I feel that if we are to assume this tremendous responsibility for the social problems of the community in which we live, particularly a big city like New York, then we must obviously be able to provide a structure that can combat this problem. And in this structure must be some degree of security as well as consistency for teachers. Therefore, I think that in the teacher training institutions, as well as in the schools, ample time must be allowed to change the role of the teacher. Despite tremendous changes in educational programs, the teacher is still put in the conventional kind of situation where he must get across to youngsters basic knowledges and skills for which he is graded. In working with the delinquent and pre-delinquent, and those youngsters who have delinquent tendencies, the most important thing that the teachers can do is to develop positive relationships with these youngsters because without them there's not going to be any learning.

We have seen in an experimental program with Teachers College a tremendous change in attitude on the part of youngsters toward school; along with that, they begin to want to learn. But this whole thing operates in an atmosphere of relating well to teachers.

But the supervisors, too, must look at this problem of delinquency and education in the urban schools with a view of changing. Too often, many of us find ourselves being hamstrung by policy, but I think we too are guilty of an evasive tactic. We have to stand up as we're asking the teachers to do, and come to grips with the problem. I can recall, in a recent district superintendents' meeting, one of the principals saying that the principal should be the head of the school and have complete authority. Many heads were bowed and questions were asked, because we don't have that kind of authority. We don't have it because we don't take it and exercise it.

In this kind of setting, working with these kinds of youngsters, we've got to take all of the negatives and convert them into positives in terms of change, in terms of working with teachers, providing them with adequate resources, developing atmospheres that youngsters want to learn in so that they will want to learn in so that they will want to come to school, and working with parents, if we are to succeed in keeping these youngsters in school.

Right now there are limited alternatives for school, like truancy and dropping out, and we would like to convert them into more positive kinds of alternatives. So, a system like ours has to look to the teacher training institutions as well as to the institutions that train supervisors, so that we can develop criteria, consistency, and an atmosphere where these youngsters can begin to learn and reawaken an interest in school.

Recently I had occasion to sit with a parent who blamed the school for all of the child's problems. She blamed ineffective teachers and other aspects of the school. In order to establish an atmosphere of helping and working with these youngsters, there is the whole area of re-educating parents and getting them involved in some degree. I don't know what that degree is at this point, but it will vary with what is going on in a particular school. Parents probably, for the most part, are the best teachers. So, if we can reorient the parents of youngsters who are now in school, and who have problems, we may be able to get them back into a positive channel. Their approach may help the schools with the youngsters. The school may then become an ego-building structure.

4092

Education and Problems of Poverty

RICHARD CLOWARD, PH.D.
Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

I would like to make several what seem to me to be very simple points today about education and about the problem of poverty in the United States. I want to begin somewhat generally and then toward the close of my remarks try to indicate some of the ways in which what I am saying is relevant to the field of education, though I don't by any means pretend to know or understand the problems which you confront in a classroom.

We are at a time in this country when there is a great deal of concern about poverty on the national agenda. The President and many other groups have committed themselves to an abolition of it. And in the strategy by which poverty is being attacked, education figures very prominently. We have, from the outset of the poverty program, had a mushrooming of programs like Head Start, educational programs for out of school unemployed youth, and the like. And, as you, I am sure, are aware, in recent months there has been increased pressure on the Congress and on those who administer the Anti-Poverty Program to shift increasing amounts, increasing proportions of the poverty funds, particularly to Head Start, but to other types of remedial educational programs as well, which attests to not merely the general success of that program but to the heightened awareness of Americans to the importance of education generally.

OEO, has in one statement after another, defined itself and its program strategy as veering away from one of handouts.

Mr. Schriver says time and again, in public statements, that the OEO program is not a new version of handout programs; it's not a new version of the dole; it's not a new version of public welfare; but is rather an effort to extend to all Americans, chiefly, of course, young Americans, a new program of opportunity by which they can presumably acquire the skills necessary to function competently in our very highly specialized and technological society, and through this competent functioning to become financially self-sufficient.

It is, in short, a program which is very much in the American tradition of self-help, of upward mobility, of self-alliance, of preparing oneself to compete against other men for the goods of this world.

I am very much in sympathy with that kind of approach, and particularly with the important role of education in it.

Having said that, however, I now want to make a series of remarks which may at first blush seem to you entirely contradictory. Though I hope as I now proceed that you will remember that I have already stated and tried to underline the fundamental importance which I do believe education has to the solution, in the long run, over the next three to five generations, of the poverty problem.

But it's not the next three to five generations that I will discuss now, and that is, after all, the period of time it takes, or has taken, in this country, for most poor groups to lift themselves, whether it's the Irish, or the Southern Italian, or the East European Jew, or whatever, who came to our shores in great number, that was roughly the period of time that it took most of those groups, as someone said earlier, to claw their way upward into a reasonably decent standard of living, and a reasonable degree of economic security. I want to talk about groups that are going to make that rise; I want to talk about people who are poor now, and make the very simple point that a strategy which depends upon equipping people with skills, educational and occupationa skills, is at best a long-range one, and that such a strategy, in effect, abandons the great bulk of people who are already poor, and who will be poor in the next generatiom, and in the one beyond that.

Before I begin, let me note that some groups in our society have not risen from poverty merely through the path, or by the route of individual mobility. One thinks, for example, of the labor movement in this country. When men in the factory system, whether in the steel mills, the rubber plants, or the automobile shops, or in the mines, when these men finally began to recognize that in their labor there was blatent power, which, if they organized, collectively, and then withdrew that labor from the factory system - when they began to realize that, and when they, in fact, began to withdraw their labor, at first in very bloody strikes and thereafter in somewhat more peaceful ones under Government regulation and supervision, they did not bargain for individual mobility. They did not ask of management that they be given skills upgrading programs; they did not ask for "head start" programs for their children; they did not ask for out-of-school employment programs for out-of-school unemployed youth; they asked for higher wages. They asked for fringe benefits, particularly, of course, pensions to give them some security in old age. They asked for some surcease from the arbitrary powers of management to hire and fire at will. They asked, in short, for some form of job tenure, some form of job security, which came to be known by the term seniority. They asked, in short, not for the opportunity for one worker to advance his interests over those of another worker, they asked not for the opportunity for one man to have great competitive advantage over another; instead, they asked that workers as a whole be elevated by altering their wages as a whole, and their conditions of work as a whole. They asked, in short, for upward mobility en masse. They asked that they be lifted as a group from deprivation.

This is merely to make the point that individual mobility, which is the guiding motif of our current attack upon poverty, is not the only way in which people have in the past lifted themselves from poverty, nor I suspect is it the only way that one has to conceive of the solution to poverty coming in the future.

Let us, having made that point, pause for a moment, and just look at the characteristics of people who are poor and as we look very briefly at those characteristics, ask ourselves what proportion of the population that is poor now, or that is likely to be poor in the next generation -- what proportion of that population can we effectively expect to reach through the educational apparatus, no matter what resources might be made available to us, no matter how one might expand the Head Start Program, no matter how one might pump money into the new Education Act legislation, etc.

The United States Government, in defining poverty, uses now what is called a variable poverty definition. It varies by two criteria.

One is whether the family is rural or urban, and the other is roughly the family size - the number of people and, to some extent, their ages. For each family size the definition is slightly different, and whether it is a family in a rural or a non-farm area is slightly different. To give you some illustrative notion of the figures they use, for a family of four, consisting of 2 adults and 2 children under 6, the United States Government defines such a family, in an urban area, as being poor if it has a cash income of less than $3,100 a year. The same family in a rural area is defined as being poor if it has a cash income of less than $1,860. Those are, by no means, generous definitions. I'm sure you would agree. Using those definitions, and scaling them off for families of size 5, size 6, etc., the number of people in this country who are poor is about 35- million. Of those 35-million people, approximately 5-million are what are called, in the United States Census, unrelated. That means they do not live in a family unit. The bulk of them, of course, are aged, although there are some younger, single people, or persons whose spouses have died or something of that sort, in that figure as well. But the bulk are aged. Now, it is self-evident, hardly needs to be argued, that the aged are not going to be lifted from poverty either now or in any future generation, by programs designed to enhance their skills. They are obviously out of the market place, and the solution to their problem is not to be found by facilitating their re-entry to it. They need money. They need higher Social Security payments. They need new legislation which would expand Social Security to all aged, whether or not they were gainfully employed. They need, in short, income redistribution.

Of the remaining 30-million, they are distributed among 7.2 - million families. One quarter of those families, or approximately

1.8 - million,families in the United States, under the poverty line,are headed by females. Those on-quarter of all families contain one-third of all individuals who are poor. They are, in short, large families. Larger than families headed by males that are similarly below the poverty line.

It's difficult to see how those families, as units, as families, are going to be lifted from poverty now, or at any point in the foreseeable future by skills upgrading programs, by full employment, by public works, by a higher minimum wage, or by any other measure which affects working conditions. For these, by definition, are women who are in essentially mothering and nurturing roles. They are not in the market place, and it is difficult to imagine why anyone would want them in the market place. For then the country would be confronted with the large task of caring for their children.

If these families are to be lifted from poverty, they, too, require income. They don't require skills upgrading; they will not be helped by all of the various measures that we think of when we think of helping people from poverty - minimum wage legislation and the like. They can only be aided by a new Federal program of income distribution.

Well, there are a great many families that are poor, whose poverty results from the ill health, either physical or mental, of the head of the household. There are a great many men in this country who have familial responsibilities who are unable, for reasons of health, to support adequately their wives and their children.

Now, it is, of course, true that there are many other families under the poverty line that can be effectively helped by job upgrading programs, by going back to school, and, in effect, learning new skills, by minimum wage legislation and the like. Of those 7.2- million families, half of them are headed by males who worked full-time for the year preceding the last Census -- these figures are all based on the 1960 Census. They worked full-time and yet earned less than the minimum which defines them as in poverty. Well, they are obviously working for very little money, and many of them would be effectively helped by minimum wage legislation, by job upgrading, by full employment and programs of that sort. My point here is not in any sense to minimize the importance of such measures, educational and otherwise, but it is to suggest that there are very substantial numbers of people, running into the millions in this country, who will not be in the least bit affected by the programs that are now being championed across the land. These groups are only going to be helped, in the short run, at least, by income distribution.

Well, we have an income distribution program in this country. We call it public welfare, and it's about public welfare that I want to say a few words today. For aside from the fact that I think it is a subject that too few people know much about, I also think it may have some importance for those of you who teach in the ghetto school, whose classrooms may, to a greater or lesser extent, be populated by youngsters whose survival depends upon the securing and the maintaining of eligibility for public welfare benefits. What kind of an income distribution mechanism is public welfare?

There are probably not two people in this room who have even the barest knowledge of our public welfare system, despite the fact that many of you may know a great many youngsters who subsist on the welfare roles.

You know, of course, that public welfare is a subject of great public concern, particularly for taxpayers, who are concerned with the mounting costs and the mounting rolls. In New York City today, for example, there are about 525,000 people who are on the welfare rolls. The rolls change constantly. That's an average daily figure, which means that in the course of a year, there are probably somewhere closer to 700,000 people who at one time or another, in the course of a year, are on public welfare.

The great bulk of those who are on welfare are on, more or less permanently. This program now costs, in the City of New York, an amount in excess of $600-million; it is second in cost only to the cost of public education. These two facts, the numbers of people on welfare, and the costs are enough to create one front page story after another, because of the great concern people have about taxes, and also about the concern people have that welfare in some fashion or another destroys people. It is often contended that welfare blunts their incentive, destroys their ambition. It is said that if people are left to languish on the rolls, they, then, in effect, become incapacitated for any competitive adjustment at a future time. The great concern in this regard is of course, expressed with respect to children - that if children are raised in welfare families, they are somehow bound to turn out to be indolent, indigent, and otherwise morally and psychologically destroyed.

Well, there is a sense in which the welfare system destroys people, but it is not, I think, in the way that it is popularly defined. And I hope in the ensuing remarks to make that point vivid.

Let me begin by noting certain other statistics that you will not find on the front pages of the newspapers; indeed, you will not find them anywhere.

In 1960, there were about 325,000 people in this City who were on public welfare. Together with a colleague, I ran some data, using some special tabulations of family income by family size, which we secured from the United States Census Bureau. We took the welfare eligibility levels for basic food and rent. In that year, for example, a family of four, if it had no income at all, was eligible for a basic food and rent grant, which comes by check every 15 days, amounting, over the space of a year, to $2,040. And for a family of five slightly more; a family of three slightly less, and so forth.

We ran off, in that same year, income data for the City of New York, by family size, and were startled to find that there were over 700,000 individuals in the City of New York who reported to the Census income, total annual income, less than the amount they would have received had they been on the welfare roles.

We, then, calculated the numbers of people who reported incomes less than 80% of the eligibility levels for public welfare, and were amazed to find that there were 500,000 individuals, 516,000 individuals, living alone or in families, with incomes below the eligibility levels. We then calculated it for people who reported income less than 50% of what they would have earned had they been on the welfare rolls, and found some 200,000 individuals in the City of New York.

We have since made similar calculations for the City of Philadelphia, Baltimore, Chicago, and we now have a man in Los Angeles

It's not so surprising because if there is one thing that public welfare departments do not do, it is to advertise for business.

One thinks, by contrast, of the vast campaign just mounted by the Federal Government to secure to the rolls the aged for the Medicare Program. Indeed, they even hired aged people with Anti-Poverty funds to go out into the slums and knock on the doors, the attic doors, the single rooms, the one room apartment houses, and so on, to try to find people to inform them of this program, and to stimulate, encourage, indeed, to drag them to the nearest office to get their names on their rolls so that they would become eligible for these benefits.

Who advertises for public welfare? Have you ever seen an advertisement?

Well, you've seen advertisements for Social Security. If you pick up any evening newspaper in this country, you are likely to find a regular Social Security column, questions and answers. I am a widow and my husband does, etc., etc., am I eligible or am I not? All kinds of technical and legalistic questions are answered, and people are encouraged to go to the nearest Social Security office for further information. And the address is given. And brochures are published and distributed. People are, in short, under the Social Security system, constantly being informed of their rights, and encouraged by their Government, both local and Federal, to take advantage of those rights. The reverse has been the case, historically, where public welfare is concerned.

Let us consider the question of special grants. In New York City, what is called a fully maintaining grant for a welfare family is made up of two parts. One part is the basic food and rent grant, which I have already referred to. That grant, however, is not supposed, and does not, in fact, contain any funds for clothing beyond very light clothing, underclothes, socks, and things of that sort. If one wants or needs heavy clothing, overcoats, galoshes, scarves, hats and the like, one has to make special application, special forms, and a special series of decisions have to be made by functionaries in the welfare system. If one needs household furnishings, dishes, bedding, mattresses, if one needs a baby carriage, if one has a new baby and needs a layette, if one needs any one of a number of those furnishings which simple decency requires that people own, one has to make special application to the Welfare Department.

Now, we all know the costs of heavy clothing, and we know the costs of dining room chairs, kitchen chairs; we know the cost of refrigerators; we know the cost of even the cheapest washing machine; we know what a decent mattress costs; we know what towels and blankets and pillows cost. We also know that most families that are poor do not possess these items of clothing, and these items of household furnishings. No one has been in a slum and ghetto home, of a welfare recipient, can come away without recognizing that there are very severe clothing and household furnishing deprivations. What, then, in 1965, did the Department of Welfare of the City of New York expend per person on the welfare rolls for that entire year for both heavy clothing and household furnishings? $40 per person per year, in the City of New York. A total of $19.6 million out of their overall budget which, in 1965, slightly exceeded $500 million.

In other words, their basic expenditures go into the food and rent grants. If people need anything beyond that what do they do? What they do in order to purchase heavier clothing and things of that sort, is to steal from the food budget. And in stealing from the food budget, they are stealing from the mouths of the children who populate your classrooms.

And I say "stealing" -- obviously, I don't mean it quite the way I say it. They are forced to steal from the food budget.

Now, the laws of this State state quite clearly that welfare clients are to be brought to a minimum standard of living. Our public welfare system is a system which is constantly under attack by hostile forces, by the politically conservative forces, or liberal forces who are equally concerned about taxes, and are concerned about what they define as the moral corruption of people on welfare. Always ignoring, year after year, the fact that 90% of the people on public welfare are either aged, women, or children under the age of 18. There are practically no persons on public welfare who are employable, if by employable you mean persons who are either male, and of age, or women who have no dependents. The great bulk of people on public welfare, as you know, in a city like this, are Negro and Puerto Rican, women with children -- they're female-headed families.

Public welfare, despite the fact that it was established, and as the law will state, that it is reponsible for maintaining people at a minimum level, is subject to all manner of political pressure, and that pressure adds up to keep the cost down. And so a whole series of practices grow up in the welfare system which are designed, to keep the cost down not consciously -- I speak now of no conspiracy -- most of the people who run the welfare systems of this country are decent people. They work, like educators, in a very difficult political milieu. And that milieu makes them do things both consciously and unwittingly that, as decent human beings, they would prefer otherwise.

Nevertheless, they are forced into a whole series of practices which have the effect of violating the rights of the people with whom they deal. One of the most flagrant of these is what is known as the midnight raid. And I'm sure that's a phrase that all of you are familiar with. It's an investigatory procedure -- every Welfare Department has what it calls a Frauds Division -- it's an investigatory procedure by which frauds investigators are sent out, after midnight, and before the hour of six. Without benefit of warrant, they will invade the home of a welfare recipient, in search of some evidence of male attire, or evidence of child neglect, or something of that sort. In the State of California several years ago - the State of California, by the way, has mass midnight raids, and on certain designated nights they sent out up to 3,000 of their investigators across the State to invade homes -- in that State several years ago, a welfare worker declined to participate in such a raid, and was promptly dismissed. He has been, for the past three years, appealing, through the courts of California; he lost in the lower courts; he's appealing on the grounds that he cannot be fired from a governmental position for refusing to violate the constitutional rights of a citizen. There's every reason to suppose that although he's lost the case in the lower courts that he will win it in the Federal courts, and it's about ready now to leave the State courts and go into the Federal courts.

This is merely one, but there are dozens of practices which are supported either by statute or by administrative custom, which constitute the most flagrant violation of the rights of that category of our citizens who are lawfully entitled to welfare but who are treated as if they have no rights at all.

Well, why should educators be concerned about these material deprivations. I estimate, incidentally, that if the welfare system in this City properly, but only minimally, clothed welfare clients, particularly children, and provided the most minimal furnishings for their homes, that the cost, the first year, would run somewhere in the neighborhood of $300 - million. That gives some idea of the extent to which welfare clients are being cheated, routinely, regularly, not in occasional cases, but across-the-board, of benefits to which they are entitled under law. And that is to say nothing about that vast number of people in the broader community who are eligible for welfare benefits but who are not on the rolls because they either are unaware of their eligibility, as welfare makes no effort to inform people of eligibility criteria, or because they are intimidated and shamed and, therefore, reluctant to apply for that sustenance which society has presumably provided for them. The cost to cities like New York of a massive recruitment program would be little short of phenomenal.

Well, why should educators be concerned about this?

Well, there is, and I assume that all educators are concerned with this, a very fundamental issue of rights here. I often hear it said, and I'm sure you do, too, that low income parents are uninterested in education, and one index that's given of that is the fact that they never appear at the school. They don't come to PTA meetings, they don't come to see the teacher, the principal, at least not as frequently as is the case with middle class parents. Well, part of the reason for that may be an attitude, a feeling about public agencies which is engendered by the whole experience of being low income people in this society. Just think for a moment of the range of public agencies which have decisive powers in the lives of the low income person. Public welfare controls the very standard of living of these families. The amount of food that's on the table; the amount they can pay for rent. It controls the amounts of money they have for clothing and furnishings. Those are pretty basic decisions in anybody's life.

Well, think of code enforcement agencies, which are responsible, under law, to see to it that people live in minimally decent habitats, that there isn't raw sewage exposed; that people are not subject to the ravages of vermin; that there is heat and hot water; and yet no one, who has any familiarity with the slum neighborhood, could say that our code enforcement agencies are in the least bit effective. For, in the final analysis, they, too, are subject to the same political pressures which impinge upon our departments of welfare; landlord groups, highly organized, articulate groups with resources to mount political pressure, with lawyers to defend their interests and to assert them in the courts; indeed, the whole apparatus of our housing courts is so flagrantly biased, in the interest of landlords, and has been traditionally, that it is very difficult for tenants, particularly those without competent, adequate legal counsel, to assert even the most minimal rights in transactions with landlords.

Or take even the school system. I have sat in not a few school suspension hearings on the Lower East Side in connection with the Mobilization For Youth program, and I'm impressed in those situations with how quickly professional people, either educators, social workers, or whatever, came to believe that in the final analysis their professional judgments are superior to others. And so the typical suspension hearing, as the typical hearing in welfare, or the typical tenant review board hearing in public housing another huge governmental agency which has vast and authoritarian controls over low income families -- I've always been impressed with these school suspension hearings, a long open table, mahogany table, with the Assistant Superintendent of Schools at one end, and flanked on the left and right, a virtual armada of experts: the teacher, the guidance counselor, the Bureau of Attendance Officer, perhaps the principal, and God only knows what other specialists and experts; and at the other end of the table, Mrs. Rodriguez and her son, Juan. It is not, by any stretch of the imagination, a very even battle. And when issues of fact are put forward in the absence of any kind of advocate for Mrs. Rodriguez, the evidence is taken for granted, and the hearing comes down to a question of what is in the "best interests of the child". Well, what is in a child's best interests is subject to some difference of opinion, depending upon where you stand. And it could be argued that professionals are not necessarily, and infallibly, the best definers of those interests. I dare say the best of us, and I speak now not to you as educators, but to all of us as professionals -- I'm a professional social worker, and I could just as easily draw my examples from that field; indeed, when I speak of public welfare, I'm talking about a system in which my field has deep penetration -- but I'm talking now about professionals generally.

Even the best professional, in any large public system, is inevitably influenced by certain organizational interests. We have, for

for example, in the school system, a discipline problem, which I've heard some comment about today. We have our careers there. We have all manner of management problems which may influence our decisions just as much as some more abstract and altruistic concern for the interests of a particular child. It strikes me as no accident, for example, that most children suspended from school are either Negro or Puerto Rican, and they are inevitably poor. We have other ways of dealing with youngsters who are difficult but who are not poor. We deal with parents; we negotiate an arrangement where the child is taken from school and put into a military academy or some other kind of situation. But that's a situation in which the parent exercises some control over the destiny of his child. What one is impressed with in many school suspension hearings, and in many other hearing procedures in the agencies of the welfare state, is the fact that control is vested almost totally in the hands of a professional elite who, by virtue of their superior academic credentials, and their legal authority within a system, take unto themselves to be prosecutor, judge and jury.

Well, we may some day recognize that the rights of people, whether it's in a public welfare hearing, or a public housing authority tenant review board hearing, or a public school suspension hearing, that these situations call for the same protections as in the criminal courts of the land. We may come to recognize that a school, and a public welfare department, and a public housing authority, exercise a vast power in the lives of people, and that a series of negative decisions by such agencies can destroy a family just as quickly as a verdict of lifelong imprisonment. Now, these are families that are already seriously undermined by economic deprivation, and if they are then cast out of public housing, in an eviction proceeding, where there was no due process protection, or their children are cast out of school, if they find it impossible to assert their lawful rights with respect to public welfare, all of this can virtually destroy a family, whose basic stability may already seriously be undermined by deprivation.

Well, I suggest to you that one possible reason that people from the low income sectors of this society do not engage easily with you, you as representatives of a huge and powerful public agency, is partly because they feel intimidated by these huge, powerful, centralized, bureaucratic systems. They feel that they have no rights, that they cannot assert what theoretical rights they may be said to have. And, under these conditions, do not feel free to enter, with any sense of dignity, with any sense of self-esteem, into relationships with these powerful figures who control the lives of their children, and their lives more generally.

I suggest, in short, that many low income people may have a certain psychological sense of powerlessness in grappling with the agents of our government in its many forms, who affect them so fundamentally

That would seem to me to suggest, then, that educators, both in their procedures for dealing with people, and in the classroom, ought to ask the extent to which peoples' rights are violated under the guise of professionalism, and ought to encourage people to know what their rights are, and to feel free in asserting them, and that somehow might have a substantial impact on the relationship between all public agencies-- not merely the public school -- and low income people.

Take the issue of sustenance. Why should a classroom teacher be concerned with the fact that thousands and thousands of low income people in this City are being unlawfully deprived of welfare benefits. Children who come to school in clothing of which they are ashamed are not likely to be the most active participants in the educational process. Children who have not a few coins to jingle in their pockets so that they can go out after school and buy an ice cream cone, like other children, may somehow or another, feel intimidated, may feel a loss of self-esteem, a sense of special status; and an invidious status at that, which may affect the way they behave at school, and children who come to school hungry, underfed, undernourished, are not likely to be capable of the same educational stimulation as children who are fed and fed well.

I also think many of these children, and here I think there is a very clear case to be made for educators to be concerned with welfare, perhaps even learn a bit about it -- many of these children suffer a loss of self-esteem because they are "welfare families". This loss of self-esteem is engendered basically by the whole American attitude toward public welfare, that people who are financially dependent are without virtue, are in some sense or another morally defective. They do not possess the character, the morality, the personality, the structure, and so forth, of those of us who have made it. And I dare say the attitudes of most teachers, as indeed the attitudes of most social workers, tend to re-enforce this. I am sure that all of you are for the American dream, and you see in your chosen occupation an opportunity to try to increase the chances for all of the children who come to your classroom to share this American dream. And that's good. I have no quarrel with that. I have no quarrel with it providing we don't assume that those people in our society who, by reason of discrimination and other factors, have been barred from that dream, are not made then to feel the added penalty of psychological degradation. And it's that latter point that I think is of particular importance for teachers.

Let me tell you of an incident that I was involved in several weeks ago. I am a close friend of the Executive Director of Haryou Act in Central Harlem and have always believed that the development of organizations like Haryou Act, ethnic institutions in the ghetto, is among the first priorities for building and strengthening the institutions of the ghetto to deal with their own problems.

And I frequently go to Haryou to speak to various groups, because I am, as Haryou has come to know, one of its staunch advocates.

I was asked recently to come to speak to a group of 150 teenagers, male and female, roughly between the ages of 16 and 20, who had been brought together, by Haryou, as part of a community action program. These teenagers were to be trained to participate in the life of their community, to take an active role in certain programs which the staff is going to help them to organize. I spoke to the group for about 10 minutes, making certain points about Haryou Act itself, and then said to them that before I went out, I would like to have some idea of what they were thinking about as forms of action. And these were very poor youngsters. They were extremely lively, and within 15 minutes I had heard from at least 30 different youngsters in the audience, that they were thinking about starting a program to clean up the parks; they were thinking about a program to try to help poor families in the neighborhood to deal more adequately with their landlords; they were thinking about trying to get parents involved in parent education -- parent-teacher programs; and so forth and so forth. After having heard of 30 programs, I finally said to them, I am interested to note that you have mentioned virtually every public agency in our municipality, and you're thinking about programs directed to those agencies, whether the schools or the rent rehabilitation administration, or the park department, and yet you have not mentioned the one governmental agency which probably touches every one of you in this room -- not to speak of thousands and thousands in Harlem. And there was an absolute silence, and no one could think of it. And I finally said, public welfare. And the moment I said that, all eyes were averted; there was a rippling giggle through the audience, and blush on the cheeks of many of those youngsters, which I think speaks for itself.

I,then, very quickly said, well, all right, before you giggle any longer, let me say a few things to you about public welfare. And I cited a few facts, some of the statistics I've given you. I talked a little bit about rights, some of the violations of the constitutional rights of welfare clients, and, as I talked, and I talked only about 10 minutes, the eyes began to come up. And by the time I had finished, in 10 minutes, their eyes were focused on mine.

Then, the most amazing thing that I have ever witnessed began to happen. I was scheduled to speak for an hour. I was there for 4½ hours, and those kids would have kept me to midnight if I had not already jeopardized my marriage by staying as long as I had.

For over three hours, there was no time when there were not at least 15 hands in the air. And those young people, for the first time in their lives, began to ask questions about public welfare. The questions were in different categories. Many of them were obviously personal. For example, a girl would stand up and say, I know a girl who lives with her mother, and she just had a baby. Will public welfare pay for her moving expenses if she wants to live separately from her mother? I would say, about 50% of all the questions were obviously questions about themselves. If your apartment is burned out, will public welfare help replace the furniture. Do you mean to say that we do have a right to overcoats and things like that? We didn't know that. And so on and so forth. Strictly information, informing them of their rights.

Another set of questions had to do with what can we do about this. Maybe we should organize welfare clients to bargain with the welfare system; maybe we should go to the Harlem Bar Association and get the lawyers interested in defending the rights of welfare clients in fair hearings, in the courts and elsewhere. And so they began to talk about an action strategy; and then there were a small minority of youngsters who kept saying, but we don't want to be on welfare; and I kept saying, I don't want you to be either. But let's face the fact that three year old children don't really have the choice. And the aged don't have the choice. Let's face the fact that there are a great many people who are poor, who are going to continue being poor, and they should not be made to give up their rights as citizens merely because of that fact. Well, most of that audience got that point and understood, for the first time in their lives that many of their own feelings about themselves were being engendered by a society which was stigmatizing them for being on welfare, and they were accepting that; they were not raising their eyes, and looking society back in the eye and saying, if we had not been subjected to 100 years of discrimination, and so forth, we probably would not be on welfare; but here we are, and don't, then, say to us that we are not human beings, that we do not have simple dignity. Don't think you can any longer tramp on our rights the way you have.

Well, I suggest that the problem that we hear sc much about, of the low social esteem of low income kids, their own sense of unworth, and all that means for their failure sometimes to enter productively into the educational enterprise, has something to do with public agencies, not just with cultural deprivation, and that kind of thing. It has to do, in part, with the way the agencies of the welfare state organize and structure their services, organize and structure their transactions with low income people. If I had had, that night in Harlem, 150 copies of the Welfare Manual, I dare say, within a month's time, I could have taught everyone in that audience to read, who could not read. For, for the first time in years, something had come into their lives that was real and immediate and which also triggered their natural altruism and their natural anger. And it helped, I think, to give them a greater sense of dignity.

Well, I suggest, then, that issues of public welfare and the relationship of poor people to governmental agencies, is an issue which does have some meaning for the classroom, and I hope you will prove me right.

Discussant

DOXEY WILKERSON, PH.D.
Ferkauf Graduate School, Yeshiva University, New York, N.Y.

It's refreshing to hear problems of education posed within the framework of the social setting, alone in which they get fundamental meanings; because the school is, indeed, an interacting unit of the culture, reflecting its dominant values, and serving the goals which prevail in the society. If these goals be democratic, good; but if they are not democratic, they still tend to be served by our schools, which are responsive to the prevailing values of the community.

We tend sometimes, in our professional discussions to talk about the school as if it were a world apart; and, indeed, too often it seems to be. But our main problems can be understood only in terms of how the larger society of which it is a part impinges upon and affects the school. And it is probable that the solutions of our main problems in the schools, especially in this area of the education of disadvantaged children, are not to come professionally nearly so much as they may come politically. By that I mean when there emerges sufficient political force in society to bring about restructuring which will alter the character of the setting in which the school functions. Probably then, we will achieve the big solutions to which we aspire in the profession.

Dr. Cloward did not talk about one aspect of this problem in which I happen to know he is much interested. I refer to the whole question of the role of the people who are disadvantaged, if you will, not in being helped by us, but their role in forcing the institutions of our society to serve their needs with dignity and more adequacy than at present tend to prevail. And, of course, his whole discussion of the welfare institution highlights the importance of what we are talking about.

As he talked about the psychological degradation which our system of welfare tends to impose upon many poor people and their children, I could not help thinking of many school situations in which we -- harboring moralistic attitudes toward people who we say are incapable of carrying their own load and must be looked after through charity -- have re-enforced that degradation. Sometimes by overt things which are said in the classroom. Perhaps even more by our squeamishness about even mentioning it in the classroom. We don't want to offend people, our children especially; and if they are involved in something that is "bad", something that is unworthy, like living on welfare, it is something which, in their interests, we avoid even mentioning in school.

The contrary position here suggested -- I don't know a better word than the one I began using -- sounds refreshing.

If the thing which is dominant in the lives of the children in slum areas -- the economic conditions under which they live and the source of whatever income they live on -- were allowed to enter the classroom, I could see some very exciting social studies lessons, much more interesting than some I have seen about the equator and its significance for the lives and customs of people. Not only reading, which Dr. Cloward mentioned, but also some interesting arithmetic lessons, concerned with family budgets and with city budgets, in which children are probably much more interested than many of the arithmetic facts and relations we now use. But more significant perhaps than such skills and knowledges, the bringing of welfare into the classroom might yield some important social understandings, attitudes, and self-concepts. Youngsters should find school a place where welfare is not a dirty word -- not to be mentioned, or to be mentioned only with contempt -- but something which reflects inadequacies in our society, not the inadequacies of individuals caught in a system they cannot influence. In such a school setting we probably could do a great deal, not only to spur academic achievement, but in the process to enhance children's feelings of validity.

Incidentally, as this discussion proceeded, I was reminded of something that several decades of teacher education have taught me, namely, that probably the less important part of what we give prospective teachers is how you go about teaching somebody, the methods. In my observations, those teachers work effectively with what we call disadvantaged children generally have methods, but also something perhaps more important. They have certain perceptions of the children they are working with that are different from those of ineffective teachers of disadvantaged children. They have certain human values and social outlooks which are genuinely democratic, which imply respect for human beings, whatever their social class or race. They have aspirations for the development of these youngsters, and confidence in their potential to develop.

We are dealing here with the emotional-value dimension of the curriculum, not merely with methods; and I think it is one of the most important aspects of education in our slum schools. Surely the whole discussion we have had on welfare and its implications for the school would tend to re-enforce such a point of view.

Finally, one could not but move toward another inference as he heard Dr. Cloward talk. We are in a period when school systems all over the country, including ours here in New York City, are preoccupied with doing something to overcome the handicaps of socially disadvantaged children. Compensatory education is now in vogue. What can we do to help overcome the scars of poverty? Now, I do not belittle such approaches at all. I think it is enormously important for our schools to try to compensate; and probably our big problem is less what is wrong with the children than what is wrong with schools ill-adapted to their needs. But I started to say that as I listened to this discussion, I could not avoid going a step further, to the idea that perhaps the more fundamental concern is not how shall we compensate for whatever limitations there are among socially disadvantaged children, but how shall we organize a society in which there are no millions of socially disadvantaged children. Professionally, in the classroom, it may be that we can make some contribution to this end -- by the ideas we help these youngsters gain of themselves, by the meaning we give to the lives which are real about them, by avoiding practices that emphasize their alienation and their sense of personal inadequacy, by interpreting to them the nature of the society of which they are a part, and why their conditions are as they are. Professionally, I think we can make some contributions in the classroom toward a society in which masses of our children are no longer scarred by poverty. The more we give young people a sense of personal dignity, especially the poor, and the more we teach them just to read, we are giving them equipment which they can use in more effective self-help struggles, which I think are the fundamental answer to many of our problems.

Apart from what we do in the classroom, such discussions as we have had today must make most of us feel that we have important

obligations as citizens, outside the school, to do something to further the development of the kind of society in which our preoccupation need not be to overcome the handicaps and the scars imposed upon the poor, the kind of society in which we do not have millions of disadvantaged children in need of what we call compensatory education.

Discussant of Conference Theme

SOL GORDON, PH.D.
Ferkauf Graduate School, Yeshiva University, New York, N.Y.

The failure of mental health services in and out of school to have a significant impact on the amelioration, reduction and prevention of mental health problems in our country has been rather well documented. Virtually every index of social pathology is on the increase: delinquency, chronic unemployment, drug addiction, venereal diseases, and mental illness. In the last ten years we've had our greatest expansion of social services, yet we have not been able to keep pace with the rate of social disintegration. I have detailed elsewhere the failure of social agencies to meet the mental health needs of an ever-growing number of disturbed, working class families[1]. All too often intake policies of such agencies are geared to meet the needs of maladjusted children from intact, middle class, white families. Schools, welfare agencies and courts - institutions which have the greatest involvement with disturbed children - are becoming increasingly aware that they cannot rely on even the "best" mental health centers for any significant help.

We have problems not only with the quantitative in adequacy of our services, but also with the qualitative. We aren't much good with addicts, alcoholics, delinquents, schizophrenics. Clinics see only small samples of those who need help, and we know that putting people on waiting lists isn't much help.

We're beginning to realize that the majority of disturbed children can easily be identified by teachers in the elementary grades. Yet, despite good models, proposed by Louis Hay and others, most school psychologists are still primarily engaged in psychological testing, focusing on how we should change the child instead of concentrating on the primary need of creating within the school a setting which fosters mental health. Any time I want to get applause, I need only mention in a speech to teachers that school psychological guidance and social work services are a waste of time. In most cases, tests and interviews affirm what the teachers already know about a child. Our schools are bursting with thousands of fully-diagnosed behavior and learning problem children for whom nothing is being done.

---

[1] Sol Gordon, "Are We Seeing the Right Patients?" American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, January 1965.

Imagine what results might be achieved if a school psychologist used his time and energy to direct teaching of psychology to children, to consult with teachers, to develop curriculum and perhaps to organize groups for children whose parents would never accept referral to a clinic. It's no accident that the few schools in the urban ghettos which are beginning to rise above the despair of non-achievement characteristic of such schools are manned by administrators and teachers who are actively associated with the Civil Rights movement. Parents are willing to come to these schools for group and individual meetings because in the context of the child's behavior or academic difficulties, school specialists are willing to take seriously the everyday problems faced by poor people in their ghetto slums. These problems have little relation to the skills and interests of the average mental health worker, or educator. Strangely enough, poor people are not really overly concerned with sibling rivalry or the resolution of their Oedipal conflicts. Of more immediate concern is that the kids are being hit on the head by falling plaster, the toilets don't flush, and there's no heat in the building.

In areas of poverty, the relative paucity of mental health facilities seems one of the least important factors in the failure to serve the needs of the disturbed population. My experience has led me away from the usual bewailing that there are limited resources for an understanding of the significant cultural, social and economic factors in community life which operate against reducing the enormous waste resulting from untreated emotional and mental illness among children and adults.

When I was able to identify with the real problems of the poor and uneducated I had no problems talking to them. Of course, a great deal depends upon why you want to talk to them and what interests you're representing. The professionals identified with the power structure in Mississippi for instance, talk to poor Negroes and find them to be lazy and ignorant. From my own experience, I've never received a more enthusiastic response than when I talked to several hundred Negroe farm workers about education for mental health in a broken down church under the auspices of the Freedom Democratic Party.

I do not think I have a romanticized notion about poor Negroes. But I found that I could not use any of the usual stereotypes to rationalize the myths about them. Discrimination and civil rights not our job? It is no wonder that when we talk about real pathology - delinquency, drug addiction, chronic unemployment, illiteracy-mental health workers and educators have so much to say but so little to offer. We would like to protect ourselves from involvement by convincing ourselves that what the poor themselves worry about is irrelevant to our roles as mental health professionals. We are called upon to contribute to "comprehensive" mental health centers. But why should we add to the existing confusion that doesn't work for the people who need it the most? The current status of our clinics has best been described by my colleague, Irwin Friedman, who says that the professionals with the highest skills work with patients who are most able to do without them, while less qualified people take care of, sometimes with great ingenuity and skill, the most disturbed people. I'm afraid that "comprehensive" simply means that more money will be available to clinic administrators who have already failed.

This is analogous to the situation in the current war against poverty. We give money to the politicians and social agencies which are notorious for their ineffectiveness in coping with the problems of poor people. Or we give money to educators who have failed to educate children in public school so that they can experiment with pre-schoolers. To this can be added the enlightened slum educator who thinks he can teach children to read with "Dick and Jane" texts by simply making Dick and Jane Negroes. No wonder so much anti-poverty money is going down the drain. A popular way to waste money these days is to organize after school programs for disadvantaged children. Exhausted by the process of not learning during the school day, they are expected to come alive and learn after school.

What new directions are we to take?

I'm not surprised that probably the most important recent advance in the area of childhood schizophrenia is evident in the significant improvement in a group of children in response to learning to read using the O.K. Moore computerized typewriter. Professor Lawrence Hopp, an educator at Rutgers University, has developed educational summer programs for 250 poor, under achieving, severe problem adolescents, with a focus on enhancing self-concept, and has achieved, with some minor mental health consultation, "cures" that would make any mental health center in this country envious.

For years we have talked about the disinterest and apathy of some parents. We have argued that we cannot teach their children because they are not interested in education, and because their parents have not taught them to be interested. But now, because of the Civil Rights movement, we are learning that many of these parents are interested, and have finally found a way of expressing their interest. It appears that mental health workers have tended, perhaps without conscious intent, to view most clinic applicants in the usual way. Instead of using labels such as "culturally deprived," or "socially underprivileged," as alibis in the failure to find a way to educate these children, we have used "unmotivated," "apathetic," "depressed," "character disorders," as our excuses for failure to offer help to those who need it the most.

Psychologists by definition and by training are charged with the study of human behavior. In terms of community mental health, the laboratories for that study are the streets of the Watts District, the plantations of Mississippi, the shacks of Selma, and the slums of Bedford-Stuyvesant.

I have a feeling that once we've started, we won't recommend more services, but different ones.

And what should be the role of the university?

Project Beacon is an interdepartmental program addressed to the problems of education in the urban slum schools. Underlying the program is the assumption that socially disadvantaged children, in conventional school settings, confront special learning problems in both cognitive and affective development, and that these problems can be minimized through appropriate school experiences which are guided by specially trained personnel. The main program thus far developed is the Project Beacon Training Program, which began in 1963 and which is designed to prepare teachers for depressed area elementary schools. Beginning next year, all instruction for Beacon students will be organized into three comprehensive seminars in the areas of 1) psychology of human development and learning, 2) social organization process, and 3) curriculum redevelopment. Study in seminars will be supplemented by a series of all day workshops and special seminars in which students and faculty have an opportunity for interaction with visiting scholars and practitioners in the field of compensatory education.

In addition to this training program for elementary school teachers, programs to prepare other types of personnel in the Beacon area are conducted by the Department of Educational Psychology and Guidance. They lead to speciality certificates in the areas of school psychology and reading. There's probably no other university in the country that's specifically training school psychologists to meet the needs of ghetto schools. The Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged began in the Fall of 1964 to assemble a wide range of information on theory, research and practice in the area of education for socially disadvantaged children.

Project Beacon has conducted a three-day conference on improving education for disadvantaged pupils, at which teachers known to be effective with such pupils interacted with professors of education, psychology, and sociology around relevant issues of theory and practice. Interestingly enough, the theme was "What University Professors Can Learn From Classroom Teachers." I don't know of any other conference that's ever been held with such a focus.

Finally, the major orientation of Project Beacon next year will be a demonstration project in an urban ghetto school - specifically, the development of academic excellence in a ghetto school through a new approach to prevention of learning disabilities.

PROCEEDINGS OF INVITATIONAL CONFERENCES ON URBAN EDUCATION

1. NORTHERN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION: PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS.

   Proceedings of the First Annual Invitational
   Conference on Urban Education, April, 1962.
   (Out of print)

2. GUIDANCE FOR SOCIALLY AND CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

   Proceedings of the Second Annual Invitational
   Conference on Urban Education, April 24, 1963.
   (Out of print)

3. AFTER SCHOOL INTEGRATION - WHAT?

   Proceedings of the Third Annual Invitational
   Conference on Urban Education, May, 1964.
   ($2.50 per copy)

4. ENVIRONMENTAL DEPRIVATION AND ENRICHMENT.

   Proceedings of the Fourth Invitational
   Conference on Urban Education, April 26, 1965.
   ($2.50 per copy)

5. SOCIAL MALADJUSTMENT: BEHAVIOR CHANGE AND EDUCATION

   Proceedings of the Fifth Invitational
   Conference on Urban Education, May 3, 1966
   ($2.50 per copy)

FERKAUF GRADUATE SCHOOL REPORTS

1. EDUCATIONAL CHANGE: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS FOR PSYCHOLOGY.

   Abraham J. Tannenbaum, Ph.D.
   Joshua A. Fishman, Ph.D.

   Presented at the May 1965 Annual Meeting of the New York State Psychological Association.
   (Free of charge)

2. THE SOCIAL SCIENCE CURRICULUM AND TEACHER RECRUITMENT IN JUNIOR AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

   Proceedings of a conference supported by the Ferdinand W. Breth Foundation, May, 1962
   ($1.00 per copy)

3. TRAINING PROGRAMS IN PROJECT BEACON, for the preparation of pre-service and in-service personnel to work in socially disadvantaged community schools as teachers of regular and special classes, administrators and supervisors, guidance specialists, therapeutic educators, school psychologists and educational psychologists, January 1963.
   (Out of print)

4. TEACHER TRAINING AND RESEARCH NEEDS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION.

   Proceedings of a conference welcoming Dr. Herbert Goldstein to the Graduate School of Education, January, 1963.
   ($1.00 per copy)

5. SYMPOSIUM

   Expanding Horizons of Knowledge About Man.
   ($2.50 per copy)

Available from:

Ferkauf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Yeshiva University
55 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10003